United Nations S/PV.3611

Security Council

Fiftieth Year

Provisional

3611th Meeting

Wednesday, 20 December 1995, 10.30 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Lavrov	(Russian Federation)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cárdenas
	Botswana	Mr. Legwaila
	China	Mr. Qin Huasun
	Czech Republic	Mr. Rovensky
	France	Mr. Dejammet
	Germany	Mr. Henze
	Honduras	Mr. Rendón Barnica
	Indonesia	Mr. Wibisono
	Italy	Mr. Fulci
	Nigeria	Mr. Ayewah
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Rwanda	Mr. Bakuramutsa
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir John Weston
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

An agenda for peace: peace-keeping

Letter dated 8 December 1995 from the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1995/1025)

95-87093 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

An agenda for peace: peace-keeping

Letter dated 8 December 1995 from the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1995/1025)

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, Greece, India, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and Zimbabwe, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lamamra (Algeria), Mr. Rowe (Australia), Mr. Manz (Austria), Mr. Patriota (Brazil), Mr. Fowler (Canada), Mr. Londoño-Paredes (Colombia), Mr. Rodríguez Parrilla (Cuba), Mr. Awaad (Egypt), Mr. Zacharakis (Greece), Mr. Shah (India), Mr. Campbell (Ireland), Mr. Owada (Japan), Mr. Wolzfeld (Luxembourg), Mr. Yoogalingam (Malaysia), Mr. Keating (New Zealand), Mr. Biørn Lian (Norway), Mr. Kamal (Pakistan), Mr. Yang Lee (Republic of Korea), Mr. Yáñez-Barnuevo (Spain), Mr. Abdellah (Tunisia), Mr. Çelem (Turkey), Mr. Zlenko (Ukraine) and Mr. Sengwe (Zimbabwe) took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/1995/1025, which contains the text of a letter dated 8 December 1995 from the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Romania, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

I should like also to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/1995/1043, which contains the text of a letter dated 18 December 1995 from the Permanent Representative of Djibouti to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

Mr. Cárdenas (Argentina): More than a year ago, New Zealand and Argentina sent a letter to the President of the Security Council, supported by a considerable number of Member States that shared our ideas related to the issue of consultations between members of the Security Council and troop-contributing countries.

As a result, a presidential statement was issued on 4 November, based on some of the ideas reflected in that letter. A mechanism was then implemented to allow consultations among Security Council members, troop contributors and the Secretariat. These consultations were intended as a first step, to be reviewed in the light of experience.

During the current General Assembly session, many delegations have expressed their views on this subject. While the usefulness of the mechanism is recognized, there is a feeling that it should be reviewed, in order to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and representativity of these consultations.

A number of Member States from different geographical regions have been meeting informally recently to discuss the existing mechanism of

consultations between troop-contributing countries and the members of the Security Council. I should now like to share some of our ideas and views on this important question.

Those Member States are: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay and Argentina.

It is our intention to review the existing system of consultations, with the aim of creating the broadest possible support among Member States for peace-keeping operations of the United Nations.

The Member States I have previously mentioned are of the opinion that there is a need for a more formal and institutionalized mechanism of consultations between troop contributors and the Security Council. This could certainly be achieved in different ways. We have considered, among others, proposals to establish a subsidiary organ, as is foreseen in Article 29 of the United Nations Charter.

This mechanism should include, in our view, the following features, which reflect the common views of Member States I have referred to.

Each consultation meeting should be held between the members of the Security Council and the contributors of troops to the peace-keeping operation in question, assisted by the Secretariat.

When the Security Council considers establishing a new operation it should consult potential troop contributors already approached by the Secretariat.

The existing practice of inviting to these meetings Member States which make special contributions to peace-keeping operations other than troops — that is, trust funds, logistics and equipment — should be continued.

The mechanism of consultations should be chaired by a member of the Security Council specially appointed every year. The chairman could be assisted by one or more additional members of the Security Council, as appropriate.

It is our view that the meetings should be held in good time before the Council takes decisions on the extension, modification or termination of the mandate of a particular peace-keeping operation. Such meetings should also be convened in the event of unforeseen developments in a particular peace-keeping operation which could require action by the Council.

In those operations where the mandate is routinely renewed, the chairman of the mechanism may decide, after consulting with the troop contributors, whether or not to hold a meeting.

Meetings should be included in the monthly tentative forecast of work of the Council and should be duly announced in the *Journal of the United Nations*.

These meetings will be in addition to those convened and chaired solely by the Secretariat for troop contributors to meet with Special Representatives of the Secretary-General or Force Commanders, or to discuss operational matters concerning particular peace-keeping operations. Members of the Security Council will also be invited to these meetings.

Background documentation and a clear agenda, as well as any substantive information available, should be provided by the Secretariat and/or the presidency or the chairman of such meetings to all participants well in advance.

The chairman of the mechanism should report to the Council the views expressed by participants at each meeting with troop contributors.

The Security Council should periodically report to the General Assembly on the work of the mechanism.

We hope that the Security Council will take into account these ideas as a demonstration of the willingness of our countries to improve the relationship and cooperation between troop-contributing countries and the Security Council itself.

Mr. Inderfurth (United States of America): Over a year ago the Council took several important steps to improve arrangements for consultations with troop contributors. The ensuing months have been a useful trial period. After several dozen troop-contributor meetings under the new format, there is general agreement that the change has been positive. But at the same time there are clearly areas where further improvements would be desirable. Today's Security Council meeting is a good opportunity to take stock of where we are, and we

commend the Ambassadors of Argentina and New Zealand for having taken the initiative to propose it.

Among the positive effects of the November 1994 changes, two stand out. One is predictability. Meetings between the Council, troop contributors and the Secretariat are now routinely convened before mandates are extended, terminated or significantly altered, and before other significant anticipated developments. The second positive result is that due to this regularity there is more meaningful opportunity for a timely exchange of views, particularly with the Secretariat, on the issues at hand.

On the other hand, it is fair to say — and I will try to make this point diplomatically — that the November 1994 statement provided for a somewhat more dynamic and substantive discussion than sometimes takes place in these meetings, as well as for somewhat greater participation by the Security Council President. These concerns are less important for relatively straightforward missions or those that are routinely extended. But for the more complex or risky missions some strengthening of consultative arrangements is worth exploring.

We have a few suggestions to strengthen the arrangements agreed to last year.

First, Council Presidents should be encouraged to take a greater part in the discussion. Of course, the President cannot speak on behalf of the Council regarding matters on which it has not made a decision, but when the Council is seized with an issue affecting troop contributors and considering alternative courses of action, the President should be encouraged to summarize those options and the views pertaining to them.

Secondly, the 1994 statement anticipated that Presidents would summarize the views of troop contributors during the course of relevant informal consultations of Council members. This rarely takes place. Although most Council members take it upon themselves to learn troop contributor views, a brief oral report directly from the presidency would better ensure that this information gets to all Council members in a timely manner.

Thirdly, this issue of timeliness is one of the most difficult. The press of events often forces the Council to act upon a Secretariat report very quickly, leaving little time for troop contributor consultation or communication with capitals. Notwithstanding this, and whenever possible, the distribution of relevant papers, the timing of meetings with troop contributors and of Council "informals" should be scheduled so as to give the fullest opportunity for an informed discussion.

Finally, the same considerations suggest that the troop contributors would benefit from somewhat greater consultation among themselves ahead of meetings on the major missions. This might allow for earlier identification of key common issues; it could expedite the task of consulting with capitals; it could permit concerns to be conveyed to the Secretariat even in advance of a Secretary-General's report; and it could result in the selection of one of their number to serve as a focal point during the regular three-way consultations with the Secretariat and the Security Council.

As my remarks have shown, the United States believes that the Council should consider further refinement and improvement in consultative arrangements with troop contributors. However, we think the basic format that now exists is a good one, and our efforts should be directed towards strengthening it rather than setting it aside in favour of new arrangements.

Sir John Weston (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom, too, is grateful for this opportunity to review the arrangements for the exchange of views between members of the Security Council and troop-contributing countries, and we pay tribute to the efforts of the Permanent Representative of Argentina and also to the Permanent Representative of New Zealand in once again focusing attention on this important question.

The arrangements established by the presidential statement of 4 November 1994 represented a considerable step forward and one which the United Kingdom warmly welcomed. But the arrangements are not working as well as they could. The meetings with troop contributors must be more than an opportunity for the Secretariat to brief on developments in operations. They should be the occasion for a serious discussion between troop contributors and members of the Council on the mandates of those peace-keeping operations in which the men and women of those countries serve.

The meetings need to be held in good time and to be provided with adequate documentation. Troop contributors must make their voices heard at such meetings, and — this is particularly important — their views need to inform the work of the Council. That is why the Council President should report back to the Council, during the informal consultations of its

members, on the views expressed by troop contributors at those consultations. It is perhaps unfortunate that this provision has not been as fully respected over recent months as the system permits.

As one of the largest contributors of troops to the United Nations over the last few years, the United Kingdom can well understand the concerns of fellow contributors whose young men and women risk their lives in the service of the Organisation. Indeed, there is probably little argument about the need to make the existing system of consultations more dependable and more effective. Where we may differ is on the means by which this should be done. The ideas that have just been aired by my Argentine colleague, who proposed a subsidiary organ under Article 29 of the Charter, may be a case in point — that is to say, a case where United Kingdom views on the means by which to get greater effectiveness into these consultations would differ.

Among our concerns are that the operational responsibilities of the Secretary-General must be protected and preserved, as must the decision-making ability of the Security Council itself. But I want to assure my colleagues that we will be listening carefully today to others' views on how the arrangements for consultation can be improved and that we look forward to working with others to give effect to any necessary changes, beginning in January next year — our own month of responsibility for the presidency.

Mr. Dejammet (France) (*interpretation from French*): It is always a good idea to follow closely the introduction of new procedures, which is why today's meeting seems to us to be useful.

It was in May 1993 that the first meeting of troop contributors took place. The Secretary-General had taken the initiative for that meeting, which concerned the United Nations Protection Force. Since then the use of that type of meeting has increased, and the Security Council has dealt, in two presidential statements — that of 3 May 1994, subsequent to the discussion of the report of the Secretary-General on "An Agenda for Peace"; and that of 4 November 1994 — with the question of the modalities for organizing such meetings.

It remains important to continue the discussion in order to find improved consultation procedures that are consistent with the balances established by the Charter and to make it possible for those States which undertake the effort of making personnel available for United Nations peace-keeping operations to be appropriately heard as to the use that may be made of their contingents. France, in its twofold capacity as a permanent member of the Security Council and as a large troop contributor to peace-keeping operations, is aware of its responsibilities in this regard.

The usefulness of the present formula for consultations, which brings together troop contributors, members of the Security Council and the Secretariat, needs no further proof, just as the interest that Member States have shown in the means of organizing these meetings is evident.

The General Assembly's debate of 28 and 29 November 1995 on agenda item 11, "Report of the Security Council", attests to the vitality of exchanges of views in this respect. The French delegation, for reasons of principle, did not participate in that debate, but we noted with the utmost care the observations that were made. We feel, in fact, that the purpose of the Assembly's consideration of the Council's report is to give Member States — in particular, those that are not on the Council — an opportunity to express their views on the Council's activities, highlighting possible shortcomings and, where necessary, making suggestions to improve the relationships between principal organs.

In this context, we feel that our duty is to listen and reflect on the way in which the Security Council could follow up on the ideas expressed by those on whose behalf the Council acts in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter.

Thus, last year, after having heard the General Assembly's debate on that item, we recommended that emphasis be placed on strengthening the role of public debate in the work of the Security Council. This seemed to us to be the most direct and most open way of responding to the desire for transparency expressed by Member States, and especially by troop contributors. At the time, we had no illusions about the possibility of reversing, in short order, a tendency to over-emphasize informal consultations. We had in mind a long-term effort to work against the force of routine habits of working in a small committee.

Clearly, we are at the very beginning of this endeavour. But the massive support expressed for the idea during the General Assembly's debate on the report of the Council is an incentive to do more in this direction in the months to come so that next year we shall be able

to present a more satisfactory record regarding the number and quality of public meetings.

We certainly agree that the relaunching of public debate, particularly orientation debate, does not exhaust the subject of the relationship between the Security Council and the contingent-contributing countries. The present formula of consultation meetings is the result of a compromise that was developed in May and November 1994, in which we find evidence of the ingenuity and pragmatic spirit of our partners from the United Kingdom, who contributed greatly to the successful completion of negotiations, which were not easy.

The arrangement now in force provides for two types of meetings. On one hand, there are regular meetings, convened and presided over exclusively by the Secretariat, to which members of the Security Council are invited. These meetings are aimed at providing for contacts with Special Representatives of the Secretary-General and force commanders and for consideration of the practical questions that arise in specific operations. On the other hand, there are meetings over which the President of the Security Council for the month and a representative of the Secretary-General preside jointly. These are aimed at facilitating exchanges of information and of opinions before decisions affecting the mandate of an existing peace-keeping operation are taken, or in cases of unforeseen events that could call for action by the Council in respect of a given operation.

The same constructive and realistic spirit should prevail today. After today's meeting it will be up to the Security Council and, more specifically, its working group on procedures to analyse the comments on the current format of meetings of troop contributors. Then, bearing in mind possible shortcomings and lacunae that will have been identified, it would be appropriate, without any preconceptions, to decide what was due to lack of experience, what was due to practical problems in the preparation for meetings, and what could be accounted for by conceptual problems in the system. Indeed, not every shortcoming would automatically require institutional reform.

On the other hand, it is perfectly conceivable that the Security Council will envisage the adoption of a document that might introduce certain changes in the arrangements now in place, if this proves necessary for a better exchange of information and of opinion. Logically such a document, should it be produced, ought to be in the form of a presidential statement. Indeed, this is the way in which the Security Council customarily takes a stand on its own procedural practices.

It would be premature for us to presume at this stage what the contents of that document might be. To facilitate future discussion, the delegation of France would, however, like to recall certain principles to which it is dedicated in respect of the question of consultations with troop contributors.

First of all, it is important to us that the Secretariat preserve in any exercise relating to the conduct of peace-keeping operations the prerogatives which are its own. It has never been the practice of the Security Council to assume responsibility for the conduct of operations. The Council determines the mandates, the Secretary-General engages the troops. It is therefore important, in our view, that the Secretary-General be associated, under all circumstances, with the chairmanship of meetings that are of deep concern to him.

It would seem to us untimely to make of troop contributors an abstract category of Member States which, for all operations, would have a right to participate in the decisions of the Security Council, whereas other Member States would not have that right. The consequence of this concern to comply with the Charter is that the consultation procedures have to be established operation by operation. If we were to aim at a structure that in theory would encompass all peace-keeping operations, we would confront the problem of who should participate, because the contributors vary from one theatre of operations to another. The existence of such a structure would mean that certain States constitute outright a new category of members, a contributor category, whether or not they are actually present on the ground. Likewise, we are reluctant to accept the idea of "potential contributors" to an operation, since any Member State is, in principle, a potential contributor. Consequently, the idea of consultations which would be held before the adoption of the mandate of a force, in other words, at a time when the force does not yet exist, does not seem realistic to us, unless we want to create a new category of Members of the Organization, which, I repeat, would seem unjust and arbitrary.

As much as we are in favour of strengthening the flow of information among the partners in peace-keeping operations — members of the Council, troop contributors, the Secretariat — we are equally doubtful about the advantages to be derived from turning

consultation and information sessions into a form of Security Council meeting. We have initial reservations concerning the idea of resorting to Article 29 of the Charter, which allows the Council to create the necessary subsidiary organs for the performance of its functions.

Therefore, we recommend maintaining a clear distinction between debates with a political flavour, in which all Members of the Organization should be able to express their views and which must accordingly be held at public meetings of the Security Council by virtue of Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter, and dialogue of a more practical and more technical nature, which should be between the Secretariat, the troop contributors and the members of the Security Council. We believe that these latter meetings are more information-oriented and that the information should be instructive, reciprocal, well prepared and well used by the Security Council, as envisaged in the presidential statement of 4 November 1994. In this respect, there is undoubtedly room for progress in the preliminary work to be accomplished to make these consultations as effective as they can be. The feeling of the French delegation, at this stage of our shared reflection, is that it is possible to make better use of the framework provided by the consultation meetings with troop-contributing countries. We are not convinced that this framework, as we know it, is inadequate and must be changed if we are to improve matters.

Mr. Qin Huasun (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): It is very useful for the members of the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries to gather here today to exchange views on United Nations peace-keeping operations and the question of regular consultations between the Council and troop-contributing countries, and it is helpful that this will be done on a regular basis.

According to the provisions of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council is the United Nations organ with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Undoubtedly, the decisions and decision-making process of the Security Council should reflect the will and wishes of the general membership. With the expansion and deepening of United Nations peace-keeping operations in recent years, the United Nations requires the timely support of the Member States. In this regard, the suggestions of troop-contributing countries and the contributions they have made to the best of their abilities have enabled the United Nations to deploy various peace-keeping operations and to carry them out as rapidly as possible. We appreciate the efforts and contributions made by those countries.

Mounting peace-keeping operations is one of the means by which the United Nations eases and resolves conflicts and creates conditions for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Only by observing the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, as well as such effective principles as obtaining the prior consent of the countries concerned, strict neutrality and the non-use of force except in self-defence, can United Nations peace-keeping operations develop on the right track. Moreover, peace-keeping operations should be kept within the confines of capabilities.

In order to improve its working methods, the Council has started, in recent years, to have regular consultations and exchanges of views with troop-contributing countries on various important stages of peace-keeping operations, such as their establishment, the definition and extension of their mandates, and the conclusion of their missions, with a view to jointly discussing and resolving problems in peace-keeping operations. This approach has not only helped to enhance the transparency of the work of the Council, it is also conducive to fostering mutual communication and understanding. It also enables the Council to listen to the views and requests of the numerous troop-contributing countries in a timely manner, so that appropriate and reasonable decisions can be made during deliberations.

The purpose of summarizing experience is to draw on the past as a guide to our future. The problems faced by the United Nations in peace-keeping operations require that the members of the Council and troop-contributing countries jointly discuss them for a resolution. We understand the desire of troop-contributing countries to expedite the improvement of the Council's working methods. We will carefully study their proposals. It is our hope that the Council can enhance its efficiency and, at the same time, improve its working methods and increase its transparency so that it can better fulfil the lofty functions entrusted to it by the Charter.

Mr. Henze (Germany): Germany took an active part in the discussions that preceded this meeting, under the able and energetic chairmanship of Argentina and with very helpful contributions from New Zealand. We fully subscribe to the Statement made by Ambassador Cárdenas summarizing the outcome of these talks. Before briefly commenting on some issues, permit me to take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Cárdenas and his team, as well as Ambassador Keating, not only for their substantial contribution in the area under consideration today, but also, with regard to Ambassador Cárdenas –

though not for the last time — for the very active role Argentina has played in respect of many Council issues during the last two years.

My country has spoken out on many occasions in favour of better coordination between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries, emphasizing in particular the importance of an improved flow of information in both directions as a major element for more transparency in the Council's activities.

Improvements in this field do not serve only the legitimate interests of troop contributors. In our view, far more is at stake. An improved mechanism of consultation is crucial also for the effectiveness of the Security Council's work. Decisions and mandates cannot be effectively implemented and peace-keeping operations cannot be satisfactorily carried out if those who carry out the mandate in the field lack information or cannot make their voices heard. Lessons learned — in Somalia, for instance, not to mention more recent cases — clearly demonstrate the detrimental and far-reaching effects which lack of consultation may have not only on a particular operation, but equally on the image of United Nations peace-keeping as a whole.

The mechanism outlined in the presidential statement of 4 November 1994, and implemented afterwards, was doubtlessly a good beginning to a more structured approach. It has, however, proved to be insufficient.

Troop contributors need information about ongoing operations. In this respect, the meetings jointly chaired by the President of the Council and the Secretariat undeniably had a positive impact. Everybody in this circle, I think, is grateful for that. But what troop-contributing countries are really interested in is having more of a political impact on decisions taken by the Security Council. The general feeling is that this goal has not yet been achieved. As a consequence, the troop contributors' interest in the existing mechanism has declined somewhat over a period of months.

We should therefore all agree that an improved mechanism of consultation is needed, particularly when decisions on the extension, modification or termination of mandates are at stake.

In this context, we welcome the idea of appointing a chairman from among the members of the Security Council for the period of one year in order to give more continuity to the relationship with the troop contributors. One could even think about nominating a chairman for each operation or group of operations, if need be.

I do not intend to repeat the major issues contained in the statement made by Argentina in their entirety. Germany supports the suggestions outlined by Ambassador Cárdenas because we hold the view that they are fair, pragmatic and realistic. No claim has been made that unduly infringes on the prerogatives of the Security Council.

Let me therefore conclude by appealing to all parties concerned to approach the suggestions made with an open mind and the degree of flexibility that is always needed on important issues. Today we have come together to breathe new life into the whole idea of better coordination between the interests of the Security Council and troop contributors.

We should, however, not look at the issues as a matter of one group of Member States making concessions to another. We should, rather, approach it from the basis of our shared interest in rendering the Security Council even more effective in order to further enhance the United Nations peace-keeping capability.

Mr. Rovensky (Czech Republic): One of the pledges the Czech Republic made when it campaigned for a non-permanent seat on the Security Council more than two years ago was that, if elected, it would actively encourage greater transparency in the Council's working methods. We have kept that promise.

We take part in the Open-ended Working Group on the reform of the Security Council, where, together with other, like-minded countries, we actively support the drive for greater transparency in the Council's working methods. By the same token, last year we supported the initiative of Argentina and New Zealand which resulted in the setting up of a consultation mechanism between the Council members, troop contributors and the Secretariat. This mechanism has been operating for a year or so, and in our view this is long enough to draw some first conclusions.

We believe that so far these consultations have been rather formal in nature. They tend to be more briefings for troop contributors that are not members of the Council than true consultations. What they lack so far is genuine dialogue.

The views and recommendations expressed by troop contributors in the consultations have, in fact, very little impact on the decision-making process within the Security Council. In fact, the end results of these consultations sometimes remind us of a folk tale in which the wolf is fed and the goat remains in one piece.

In our statement in the Fourth Committee, we stated, *inter alia*, that troop contributors are today at the mercy of Security Council members. One would hope that Council Members will view these consultations with troop contributors not just as a chore, but as a source of wisdom and as a relevant form of input into the formulation, as well as termination and modification, of peace-keeping-operation mandates. Let us not forget that Security Council members do not always have troops in a given peace-keeping operation, and while they have the ultimate political responsibility for formulating mandates, the practical experience from the field might not always reach them. The consultations with troop contributors give them a perfect chance to get such information firsthand. It is therefore surprising and somewhat disappointing that in several instances some members of the Security Council did not even bother to attend these consultations.

After all the criticism, let me end on a positive note. The consultation mechanism between the Security Council, troop contributors and the Secretariat is without a doubt a step in the right direction. In fact, most delegations, troop contributors or not, acknowledge this.

What is needed, however, is further improvement and refinement of the consultation mechanism so that it is less formal and more effective in ensuring closer communication and exchanges of views between the Security Council and troop contributors.

We believe that the proposal introduced by Argentina, which we strongly support, achieves this goal. We thank Ambassador Cárdenas and Ambassador Keating for this important and timely initiative.

Mr. Legwaila (Botswana): The delegation of Botswana attaches great importance to the question of transparency in the work of the Security Council. We therefore welcomed the procedures instituted last year providing for regular consultations between the members of the Security Council and countries contributing troops to United Nations peace-keeping operations as a significant development in the process towards such transparency. The participation of troop contributors in the exchange of views regarding any peace-keeping operation has opened up the work of the Council and made it more responsive and accountable to the interests of the troop contributors. This consultative mechanism has contributed significantly to the improved relations between members of the Council and troop-contributing countries, and it will, hopefully, lead to efficiency and effectiveness in peace-keeping operations.

The issues raised in the proposal of Argentina and 33 other States — to whom we owe a debt of gratitude — are not completely new. They have been discussed by the Council on previous occasions. Regrettably, some members of the Council remain opposed to the proposed establishment of a subsidiary organ of the Security Council to formalize the procedures set out in the Council presidential statement of 4 November 1994. We have no doubts about the usefulness of the existing mechanism for consultations between members of the Security Council and countries contributing troops to United Nations peace-keeping operations. As a matter of fact, it has afforded troop-contributing countries the opportunity to put their views across regarding decisions that may have a bearing on their contingents. But we do not think this mechanism does any justice to the spirit of Article 44 of the Charter.

Article 44 provides for the participation of troop-contributing countries

> "in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents".

The existing mechanism, however, does not give troop-contributing countries the full opportunity to "participate in the decisions of the Security Council", as foreseen in Article 44. The establishment of a more formal mechanism such as the one proposed by the 34 co-signatories, we believe, would enhance the level of participation of troop-contributing countries in Council decisions, particularly because the chairman of the mechanism would be required to submit written reports to the Council on the views expressed by participants at each meeting, as is the practice with other subsidiary bodies of other United Nations organs.

The co-sponsors of this initiative do not intend to usurp the powers bestowed by the Charter on the Security Council in matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. The proposal to establish a formal mechanism is only intended to improve the representative character of the decision- making process in the Security Council. The interest that Member States

of the United Nations have shown in the work of the Security Council in recent years should be viewed as a positive development. The Security Council derives its authority and legitimacy from the general membership of the United Nations that are not members of the Security Council. We believe it is only fair that they should make a contribution to the work of the Council if it is to act effectively on their behalf in accordance with Article 24 (1) of the Charter.

Mr. Fulci (Italy): Let me begin by expressing our sincere appreciation to the Permanent Representatives of New Zealand, Ambassador Colin Keating, and of Argentina, Ambassador Emilio Cárdenas, who were the movers and doers behind the ideas and initiatives we are discussing today.

From the very beginning the Italian delegation made clear its strong interest in taking part in the discussions among 34 troop-contributing countries belonging to the different regional groups.

I was among those who had the honour of co-signing the letter addressed to you, Mr. President, on 11 December suggesting today's debate, because we believe that it is fully consistent with the Council's previous deliberations, particularly with the presidential statement of 4 November 1994, which indicated improved procedures for consultations with troop-contributing countries. Today, we are ready to move further.

Certainly, improvements have been made, especially with regard to the calling of regular meetings with troop-contributing countries presided over jointly by the President of the Security Council and by a representative of the Secretary-General. These meetings are duly announced in the monthly calendar of the Council's work. They are meetings for consultation and not merely for information purposes. They take place before, and not during or after, the deliberations of the Security Council on any given peace-keeping operation. The participation of troop-contributing countries that are non-members of the Council has so far, in our opinion, been at a satisfactory level, and those meetings are becoming more successful as the feeling spreads that they can be a very appropriate and useful place indeed for troop contributors to express legitimate questions, concerns and expectations.

In order to improve them further we suggest that they be held within a reasonable margin of time prior to the Council's decisions in order to give the delegations of troop-contributing countries more time to consult their capitals and all the authorities concerned, civilian and military alike. Moreover, the documentation does not always seem to have been prompt and thorough. Improvement could also be made in this field.

Italy fully endorses the statement by the Permanent Representative of Argentina, whose suggestions and proposals deserve the Council's utmost attention and should be acted upon. The key proposal concerns the establishment of a structured mechanism that would assure not only a constant flow of information between Council members and troop-contributing countries but also consultation on matters of substance. This corresponds to the expectations that full use be made of the possibilities offered by the Charter — expectations which Italy has been voicing for some time, both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, ever since the general debate during the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

Certainly, considerable progress has been made following the bitter experience in Somalia. But the fact that we are not living in a perfect world is proved by the concern, shared by many, that the present financial difficulties of the United Nations will lead to measures that will seriously affect the resources and capacity of the Department of Peace-keeping Operations. Such austerity measures would also have a negative effect on the relationship between the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries and seriously hinder planning activities and day-to-day management of peace-keeping operations.

If, for example, there were to be a downsizing of the two vital organs of the Department of Peace-keeping Operations, the Office of Planning and Support and the Situation Centre, how could the dialogue between the troop contributors and the Secretariat be maintained at a satisfactory level? Some would say that this is a problem that regards the Secretariat and not the Security Council. It is certainly true that the Security Council must operate in the political sphere of decision making and not get involved in macro- or micro-management, but it is clear that if the Secretariat's ability to interact with troop contributors were weakened, that would have to be compensated for by increased consultation between the Security Council and the troop contributors.

A concrete response to the aforementioned problem is therefore necessary at present, as it will be in the future, to assure the success of peace-keeping operations. In the end, only a direct, true voice in the decision-

making process by countries that contribute troops or resources can ensure adequate participation and an efficient chain of command and control able to delegate authority to commanders in the field.

The consultation mechanisms should not only invest the political sphere, but should be extended to the military sphere as well. We should therefore reflect on the idea of revitalizing the Military Staff Committee, providing for inclusion in it of the countries that contribute troops to each operation. It is only through participation and transparency that we can win over public opinion, whose support is essential in confronting the burden of peace-keeping in terms of funding and personnel.

I have one final consideration. The attention that the United Nations dedicates to this problem is a direct reflection of its capacity for increasing democracy and transparency in the Organization. Therefore, today's initiative fits extremely well into the broader road towards reform, on which my country's ideas and proposals are well-known.

Mr. Wibisono (Indonesia): The Council's consideration of a single agenda item today — "An agenda for peace: peace-keeping" — is, in our view, most appropriate and timely. This issue has become all the more important at this critical juncture of history, particularly after the end of the cold war, when, on the one hand, demands are increasingly being made on United Nations peace-keeping operations, while, on the other hand, the United Nations is confronted by a severe financial crisis. In the light of these new realities, it is incumbent upon the Member States to discuss this particular item, since it relates to an issue to which we all devote considerable interest: the improvement of the working methods of the Security Council.

It is against this background that the Indonesian delegation would like to associate itself with the statement made by Ambassador Cárdenas of Argentina on behalf of the group of Member States interested in exploring the possibility of establishing viable mechanisms to enhance the productive relationship between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries. Proper communication between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries is particularly important. While the Indonesian delegation recognizes that improvements have indeed already been made in this respect, we consider that further progress could still be made in order to significantly enhance transparency in the work of the Security Council. Enhanced transparency in the Council's decision- making process is, in our opinion, of the utmost importance, particularly with regard to peace-keeping operations, where the interests of contributor nations are involved.

It is the view of my delegation that such transparency and consultations would promote the active participation of troop- contributing countries, which could ultimately generate wider appeal and support for peace-keeping endeavours launched by the Security Council, while lending greater credibility and legitimacy to its activities.

As regards consultations, my delegation would like to underline the necessity for them to be held well in advance of any decisions by the Security Council, in order to allow ample opportunity for both the Council and troop-contributing countries to undertake comprehensive and in-depth discussions, particularly considering that peace-keeping operations are presently dealing with a new brand of more complex conflicts, thus making them more expensive and entailing a high degree of dangerous risks. Such consultations would give the Council sufficient time to take the appropriate decisions to extend, modify or terminate the mandate of a particular peace-keeping operation. Such a measure would also make the Council sensitive to the viewpoints and legitimate concerns of troop-contributing countries that are not members of the Council.

On the other hand, it would also allow the troop-contributing countries fully to understand the scope and magnitude as well as the nature and characteristics of such operations, including the possible risks involved. Moreover, it is imperative that these consultations be substantive in nature and practical in approach, thus reflecting a closer dialogue between the Council and troop-contributing countries, which in turn could guarantee their implementation or improve the prospects of their implementation. In this context, the role of the Secretariat as the knowledgeable source in providing detailed, accurate and relevant information in a timely manner is of paramount importance. We therefore fully support the idea that the Secretariat should provide such assistance.

In view of the foregoing, my delegation believes that the work of the Council would be greatly facilitated if the elements contained in the statement made by the Ambassador of Argentina were to be given serious consideration. In particular, my delegation would like to emphasize the importance of considering the proposal to establish a subsidiary organ, as provided for in Article 29

of the Charter, alluded to in the statement of Argentina. We look forward to the Council's taking appropriate action in due time, and my delegation is ready to participate in the deliberations.

Finally, my delegation regards the Security Council's decision of 4 November 1994 to improve the consultative process as a first step in improving the overall communication between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries. Hence, we regard the statement delivered by Argentina to be a logical and appropriate development towards the establishment of a consultative mechanism that affords the Council and troop-contributing countries the opportunity to participate in a modality that is mutually beneficial and constructive.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of the Russian Federation.

Russia is devoting serious attention to the question of improving the working methods and procedures of the Security Council. A solution to this complex task must be sought within the framework of a carefully considered evolutionary approach, above all in the interests of preserving and strengthening the efficiency and effectiveness of the Security Council's work. We believe it important that innovations in this area, which are necessary, should not work against the Council's functions under the Charter or its prerogatives in the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Russian Federation has actively supported the initiative of a large group of countries, led by Argentina and New Zealand, to convene a formal meeting of the Security Council to discuss the question of consultations between the Council and countries contributing troops to United Nations peace-keeping operations. Nearly 2,000 Russian citizens are participating in such operations in various regions and we are thus well aware of the need to establish such machinery. This link is particularly important when force is brought into play during the implementation of an operation. This is an extremely sensitive question and any reaction made or action undertaken behind the contributors' backs is fraught with serious consequences.

We note with satisfaction that many of the recommendations regarding such consultations that were made in the Security Council's presidential statement a year ago are being successfully implemented. Meetings are taking place between members of the Council, troop contributors and the Secretariat before decisions are adopted on the extension, termination or significant modification of the mandate of a given operation. The information supplied at such meetings has improved. At the same time, as everywhere, there remain shortcomings that affect the effective implementation of operations, and these shortcomings must of course be eliminated. The means of improvement are indicated in particular in General Assembly resolution 50/30 and the report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations.

This is also important because, despite the impending downsizing of several major operations — those in Bosnia, Rwanda and Haiti — the burden on the Organization in this area remains significant. We therefore cannot allow its peace-keeping potential to be weakened.

In our view, this can be achieved through a flexible and pragmatic approach to strengthening the mechanism for consultations between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries. It would probably make sense to see how planned improvements work as they are implemented; the ordering of additional measures could then be based on such an analysis.

As we see it, the most important thing is not the formalization of meetings as a goal in itself, but rather making it possible for the views of all potential participants in a given operation to be effectively taken into account. Clearly, the group of troop-contributing countries will vary from one operation to another, and that alone creates serious practical complexities with regard to institutionalizing a consultative mechanism. We are in favour of timely involvement, before the Security Council adopts decisions on a given peace-keeping operation, in particular on the deployment of a new operation, by countries contributing not only contingents of troops but also equipment and other services. It is useful to invite Special Representatives of the Secretary-General and force commanders to certain meetings. All of this is particularly germane to the preparations for new and complex operations that have enforcement elements, *inter alia* to ensure that such operations properly implement the Security Council's mandate. Where a routine extension of the mandate of an operation is involved, however, it could be possible, upon agreement between the countries concerned and the Secretariat, not to hold consultations each time.

It would be useful to make it possible for information on topics to be discussed at the consultations

to be more widely disseminated among other delegations, first and foremost among those most affected by a given United Nations peace-keeping operation, even though they may not be troop-contributing countries.

Russia is open to constructive ideas and initiatives to enhance the effectiveness of the way in which meetings with troop-contributing countries are held. We must remember here that the consultative mechanism was devised and put in place with a view to helping the Security Council in carrying out its Charter functions. In our view, the functioning of that mechanism must retain precisely that character.

We hope that the results of today's discussion will make it possible to achieve further progress towards strengthening the peace-keeping potential of the United Nations, in accordance with the Charter.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

The next speaker is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Owada (Japan): Let me begin this brief statement of the delegation of Japan by associating myself with the statement made earlier by the representative of Argentina. In addition, I should like to offer some further observations of my delegation on several points which are of particular importance to Japan.

First of all, I wish to emphasize the significance of the fact that the Security Council is now itself engaged in the process of improving its own working methods. The problem of improving the working methods of the Security Council is a subject which the General Assembly has been discussing for a number of years from the standpoint of how to increase the transparency of the work of the Security Council and thus enhance its legitimacy. My delegation has participated actively in those discussions, as we regard the subject to be one of legitimate concern to all Members of the United Nations. Naturally, it should be acknowledged that the Security Council, in the final analysis, is the master of its own procedures. For this reason, the fact that the Security Council itself has been engaged in this exercise is all the more important in the context of the overall process of Security Council reform and the reform of the United Nations as a whole.

Japan has always maintained that, in the field of peace-keeping operations, consultations are essential between the Security Council and countries contributing to these operations. This idea was finally put into practice with the statement by the President of the Council of 4 November last year. While Japan welcomed this development, it has continued to believe that greater efforts should be made to further improve the process and mechanism of these consultations in a number of ways.

First, the countries contributing to the actual operations — whether their contributions are in terms of military and other personnel, financial and logistical support, or assistance in any other area — have a legitimate interest in being part of the Security Council's decision-making process on these matters, through such consultations. The importance of such involvement of these contributing countries in the decision-making process becomes clear when one considers that some of the United Nations peace-keeping activities since the end of the cold war have been more successful than others and that in each case the countries contributing to the operations will have to accept part of the responsibility for such success or failure.

Secondly, the more recent experiences of United Nations peace-keeping activities in the post-cold-war era have ranged from such comprehensive and multifaceted operations as those in El Salvador and Cambodia to such complex operations involving elements of peace enforcement as those in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia. And the crisis in Rwanda has further underlined the need for an improved rapid-reaction capability. If contributing countries are expected to meet the needs of such different types of action, full consultations will surely be in order so that contributing countries can assess the situation and decide whether or not to accept the responsibility for any particular type of action.

Finally — but not least important — Japan believes that such consultations between the Security Council and the contributing countries are essential in order to give the decisions of the Security Council the maximum degree of credibility and acceptability and thus enhance the effectiveness and viability of the Council's action.

While Japan does not insist on the creation of a subsidiary organ for this purpose under Article 29 of the Charter, it believes that a further institutionalization of the consultation mechanism, along the lines described in

the statement made by the representative of Argentina, would be highly desirable. Japan is in favour of such an institutionalization of the elements and measures, as proposed by the representative of Argentina in his statement, in the form of a resolution of the Council. This could include measures relating to adequate prior notice and information, periodicity, and reports to the Council on the views expressed by the contributing countries in the course of such consultations.

Japan also attaches great importance to the current practice whereby the concept of "troop-contributing countries" includes countries making various contributions of a substantive nature, including but not limited to the contribution of troops. In this connection, Japan endorses the present system by which the Security Council invites to the consultation process those Member States which contribute to peace-keeping operations through various means other than troops, such as logistical support, supply of equipment or specific financial contributions to the relevant trust fund. In fact, Japan's own experience in the field of peace-keeping operations in recent years has varied so greatly, ranging from the contribution of troops to the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia and to the United Nations Operation in Mozambique, as well as our recent decision to provide personnel to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, to voluntary financial contributions for many other operations. In all these cases, the participation of Japan in the consultation process in diverse capacities has been most helpful in enabling us to determine at first hand how our contributions to these operations can be most useful. My delegation hopes strongly that this practice will be included among the points to be institutionalized in the form of a resolution.

My delegation also wishes to suggest that the countries contributing to peace-keeping operations could, for their part, improve the ways in which they participate in these consultations. They could, for example, exchange ideas among themselves beforehand, with a view to preparing themselves for the consultations. This would be possible, however, only if ample advance notice were given of the forthcoming consultative meetings.

Japan is confident that the Security Council will continue to make constructive efforts to meet the legitimate interests of countries contributing to peace-keeping operations, with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of its decision-making and improving the process of implementation of its decisions.

I should like to conclude my brief intervention by expressing my gratitude to the delegation of Argentina for taking the important initiative of having this meeting convened. Japan looks forward to working closely with like-minded countries and with the members of the Council towards our common goal of creating a Security Council that can be more effective.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Ukraine. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Zlenko (Ukraine): The delegation of Ukraine fully associates itself with the position presented by the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Cárdenas. We support all the provisions of his statement, which fully reflects our understanding of this important issue of cooperation between the members of the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries.

A year ago, at a formal meeting of the Security Council, we discussed this vital problem. As a result, the informal mechanism of consultations was established. Its functioning has shown usefulness, but at the same time it has lacked effectiveness. In our opinion, the present exercise should result in the institutionalization of a mechanism of consultations.

In this regard, I cannot but mention Article 44 of the United Nations Charter. It clearly defines the principle of consultations between the two groups of States. Although this Article deals with operations undertaken in accordance with Chapter VII, the principle contained in this Article is in full conformity with the spirit of the United Nations Charter and should be interpreted extensively.

The practice of consultations, held since November 1994, has shown that instead of a dialogue between the Security Council members and the troop-contributing countries, we have had either monologues by the contributors or briefings by the Secretariat. Regrettably, the members of the Security Council played the role of mere statists, and the level of representation of the Council members at these meetings speaks for itself. In this context, we hope that formalizing the relationship of the aforementioned States, in accordance with Article 29, as suggested by Argentina, will automatically upgrade the level of these consultations.

It is also necessary to define the role of the Secretariat in this context. The mechanism to be established in accordance with Article 29 easily resolves this somewhat sensitive issue. In this case, the Secretariat will offer its services to the member States of the Security Council and troop-contributing countries, and will play an auxiliary role. Primarily, troop contributors will have an opportunity to influence the formulation and adoption of the decisions relating to the peace-keeping operations in which they participate.

Finally, our delegation believes that the formalization of the process of consultations will create enhanced opportunities for the improved provision and exchange of information between the member States of the Security Council and the States contributing to the peace-keeping operations. Under present conditions, the valuable proposals made by the delegations of the troop-contributing countries do not find any practical application; at least, we are not aware of any. It also seems odd that the best reference papers with regard to the United Nations peace-keeping operations are prepared by the Department of Public Information and not by the Department of Peace-keeping Operations. With a new institutionalized mechanism, these useful documents, in more detailed form, could also be prepared by the Secretariat for the troop-contributing States.

The delegation of Ukraine believes that today's exchange of views will help the member States of the Security Council to take an appropriate decision that meets the interests of the international community as a whole.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Lamamra (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): It is a great pleasure for me to congratulate you, Sir, on the way in which you have been presiding over the Security Council during the month of December. I am convinced that under your skilled guidance, the Council, which has been engaged in intense activity during this month, will find, as a result of its present deliberations, new ways of functioning and interacting with the Member States of the United Nations.

I should like also, Sir, to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Al-Khussaiby, for the efficiency with which he discharged the duties of the presidency during the month of November.

Finally, I must express here, to those members of the Council whose mandate is coming to a close, our deep appreciation for their availability and for the dialogue that they have maintained with us. This commendable attitude accords precisely with the objective of today's debate, which, on the initiative of a large number of countries — including Algeria — is raising the issue of improving procedures and arrangements for the exchange of information and consultations among the Security Council, the Secretariat and the countries participating, in one form or another, in peace-keeping operations. In this context, I should like to hail in particular the role of Ambassador Cárdenas of Argentina and to associate myself with the views and suggestions contained in his statement.

The important question under consideration is not a new one. But it has become far more pressing in the light of the lessons learned from the unfortunate experiences and the limits of existing consultation mechanisms. At the core of the political problems raised are those inherent in the decision-making process within the Security Council, the encouragement of contributions of Member States to missions in the field, and the mandates entrusted to the Secretary-General to plan, guide and evaluate peace-keeping operations in conformity with the political environment in which they are deployed, as well as with all other factors which impact on their conduct.

While it is true that the Security Council is often required to react rapidly, and that the establishment of an operation sometimes in itself is a clear political signal of the will to take purposeful action, the effectiveness of such intervention by the Council is often, in the last analysis, subject to the overall adherence of Member States to the objectives and terms of reference of a given operation.

A rapid and effective reaction by the United Nations ultimately depends on the will of Member States fully to support peace-keeping operations, including by providing personnel and by granting other facilities. Member States would be all the more willing to do so if they were allowed to play a more important role in the outline of these operations — that is, to participate in the definition of general objectives, the follow-up of various activities and the assessment of performance in carrying out clear mandates which have the backing of the international community as a whole.

New Zealand and the Argentine Republic made efforts last year to obtain from the Security Council an

enhancement of the role of Member States participating in peace-keeping operations through the establishment of a Committee of the Council for purposes of consultations on the basis of Article 29 of the Charter, which provides for the creation of subsidiary organs. The combination of resistance to change in the functioning of the Security Council and some inexplicable apprehensions led to the adoption of the presidential statement of 4 November 1994. Its implementation was reflected by the organization of a modest series of meetings, often held in a purely technical format, to improve information flows, without, however, allowing the troop-contributing countries and other interested countries to be effectively involved in actions taken by the Council and the Secretariat in the political and operational management of peace-keeping operations.

It is an established fact that the success of operations depends on the organizational capabilities of the United Nations Secretariat, but it is also — and above all — subject to the political will of Member States to shoulder their peace-keeping responsibilities. That will can only be encouraged by improving arrangements allowing for significant consultations and exchanges of broad information with the troop-contributing countries.

If it is indeed desirable that the countries contributing personnel to peace-keeping operations, or assuming other responsibilities in regard to such operations, should remain convinced of the need for and usefulness of their support, there should be a way to organize more systematically and formally the taking into account of their views and suggestions. It would be appropriate to form a special committee of countries contributing to any United Nations peace-keeping operation, charged with officially making known to the Secretary-General and the Security Council national sensitivities affecting primarily operational issues — indeed, political ones — regarding the mission. Such committees could be established at the time of the definition of mandates and the identification of potential participants, but before the taking of a decision by the Security Council, to ensure that the plan and proposals formulated by the Secretary-General — in particular, regarding the conduct of the operation and the rules of engagement — receive broad backing. The consideration of these issues in advance would allow the Security Council to take decisions regarding mandates with the certainty that potential troop-contributing countries are in favour of the planned operation and commit themselves to it in full agreement with the guidelines and conditions for its conduct.

In the same spirit, the establishment of a framework in which the troop-contributing countries could exchange their views and experiences regarding operational aspects common to various peace-keeping operations would be useful and beneficial and would positively supplement the work of the General Assembly's Committee of 34.

Under Article 24 of the Charter, the Security Council acts on behalf of all the Member States of the United Nations. Therefore, acts of the Council acquire additional legitimacy when they flow from expanded consultations carried out in a spirit of partnership and aimed at optimal efficiency. From that point of view, the informal practice of "groups of friends" — some of which, I must emphasize, have done more useful work than others in the recent experience of the Security Council — would stand to gain in terms of both usefulness and credibility if the objective of such groups were rigorous and in-depth follow-up of situations concerning which the Security Council is shouldering responsibilities, and also if the membership of those groups formed a genuinely representative and receptive framework for the contributions most likely to fully assist in the formal decisions of the Council.

In that context, it is clear that, along with a core of members of the Council and troop-contributing countries, the countries of the region concerned and competent regional organizations have an irreplaceable role to play in the interest of collective action by the United Nations. Similarly, Secretariat reports whose information and guidelines impact on the deliberations of the Council, and serve as a reference point for the troop-contributing countries, have a key function. In so far as these reports deal with situations exhaustively, lucidly and impartially, the contributing States can feel encouraged to accept complex solutions, when the problems are also complex, and therefore can make the necessary efforts.

The presidential statement of 4 November 1994 opened up the prospect of concerted action by Member States of the United Nations in peace-keeping operations through arrangements for the exchange of information and opinions between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries. The time has now come to take this to a qualitatively new stage. In so doing, the Council would be meeting the need for transparency and democratization in its decision-making process, which are essential in the search for efficiency. The Council would also thus enhance the authority of its decisions and would give peace-keeping operations in the field the best possible chance of success.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Algeria for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Awaad (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like, at the outset, to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and to express the appreciation of the delegation of Egypt for the important role that you have been playing in your high post — a role underscored by your high diplomatic skills.

Allow me also to express our appreciation to the Permanent Representative of Oman for the outstanding work as President of the Council during the month of November 1995.

At the outset, I wish to convey the Egyptian delegation's appreciation to the Security Council for its prompt response to the request of the group of States whose representatives signed the letter asking that this meeting be convened with the aim of considering the means whereby the effectiveness of consultations between the Council and countries contributing troops to peace-keeping operations may be consolidated and enhanced.

Egypt had the honour of participating in this initiative, which was taken and sponsored by Argentina, with the participation of 36 States, from different geographic regions of the world and of various degrees of economic growth. All of those States share a common interest, namely increasing the support of all States for the role performed by the United Nations in the area of peace-keeping, and enhancing the efficacy of that role. This is an objective that, we are sure, enjoys extensive international support. Therefore, I should like to extend thanks and appreciation to the delegation of Argentina and in particular to Ambassador Cárdenas, for sponsoring this new initiative. Egypt's delegation wishes to express its full solidarity with the contents of the statement by Ambassador Cárdenas in this respect.

I wish to point out also that the present initiative stemmed from the basis we laid a year ago through the initiative taken by Argentina and New Zealand, which led to the adoption by the Security Council of the presidential statement (S/PRST/1994/62) of 4 November 1994. In that presidential statement, the Council established general rules governing the procedures for consultations with troop-contributing countries which consultations are to be held through meetings between members of the Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat, in good time before the Council decides to effect significant changes in the mandate of any peace-keeping operation or to terminate any particular such operation.

The Council also decided to keep the arrangements for the exchange of information and views with troop contributors under review in order to consider further measures to enhance those arrangements in the light of experience.

At the time, we welcomed those consultation arrangements adopted by the Council as they represented marked progress towards recognition of the right of the countries that contribute troops to peace-keeping operations to participate in making the decisions that affect the security and safety of such troops, in accordance with the spirit of Article 44 of the United Nations Charter.

Notwithstanding, the delegation of Egypt, in statements to the General Assembly and to the Security Council, has repeatedly voiced the conviction that the consultation arrangements adopted by the Council fall far short of providing for troop-contributing countries' effective participation in the decision-making process as they lack any formal or institutional aspect and are held in a manner that lacks regularity.

Practical experience has shown that most consultation meetings held in accordance with the presidential statement made on behalf of the Council have been held without allowing the troop-contributing countries enough time to communicate to their delegations in New York their views or to supply those delegations with whatever information may be available to their Governments. The troop-contributing countries have also noticed that those consultation meetings have become a mere formality that is performed as a ceremonial act that has no effect whatever on the Council's decision when the Council modifies the mandate of a peace-keeping operation.

At meetings of the special committee dealing with peace-keeping operations, as well as at meetings of the General Assembly in the course of this fiftieth session, numerous States have expressed the view that the present consultation arrangements, despite their many benefits, need to be reviewed urgently by the Security Council.

The statement by the Ambassador of Argentina has expressed the least common denominator in the positions of the group of States, including Egypt, that requested the convening of this meeting. We affirm that the proposals those States agreed to put forward represent a fine balance that reflects the interests of the troop-contributing countries, while taking into account the responsibilities and spheres of competence of the Security Council with regard to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The first step towards reforming and developing the consultation arrangements between the Council and the troop-contributing countries is to institutionalize and formalize those consultations. We propose in this respect that the Council, on this occasion, should adopt a resolution to regularize the consultation arrangements. Such a resolution should aim in its preamble at the implementation of Article 44 of the Charter. The resolution could also provide for the establishment of a subsidiary organ of the Security Council, in accordance with Article 29 of the Charter. The primary task of that subsidiary organ would be to conduct such consultations before the Council decides to adopt a resolution regarding the mandate of a particular peace-keeping operation.

Here, we must reaffirm the importance we attach to ensuring that such consultation meetings should have an effect on the Council's resolutions. We wish to highlight also the importance we attach to ensuring that such consultation meetings should provide the effective means for the troop-contributing countries to voice their concerns and of ensuring that such concerns are taken into account by the Council when the Council makes its decisions. We are well aware of the fact that the creation of a subsidiary organ of the Council would not, by itself, automatically guarantee the achievement of this goal and that there is a need for the Security Council to adopt a well-informed and clear resolution whereby it would recognize an official role for the countries contributing troops to peace-keeping operations as full partners in the decision-making process with regard to the mandate of any particular operation.

In order to guarantee a positive outcome to consultation meetings, the participating troop-contributing countries should be informed of such meetings well in advance. In addition, before each meting, the Secretariat should provide the States concerned with the information that is available to the United Nations from the theatre of operations, as such information could have implications for the resolution the Security Council may adopt. Consultation meetings should also be held well in advance of the adoption by the Council of the relevant resolutions, so that delegations may be able to advise their Governments of the available options and to receive their Governments' instructions in that regard.

There is also a need for consultations with potential troop-contributing countries before the adoption by the Council of the mandate for the operation in question. Furthermore, the States the Secretariat believes to be in a position to contribute troops to any given operation could be invited to a consultation meeting with members of the Security Council. The object of such a meeting should be to acquaint such States with the expected conditions of the operation and of the probable role of their troops in the operation. The contributing States should also be afforded the opportunity of voicing their views with regard to the best means of implementing the mandate of the peace-keeping operation.

The preceding proposals in no way infringe the authority or competence of the Security Council in the area of maintaining international peace and security. In fact, those proposals would contribute to ensuring and enhancing the democratic and representative aspects of the Security Council's resolutions and guarantee the support of troop-contributing countries and peoples to those resolutions. In addition, the proposed measures would have to do only with fundamental changes that may be introduced to the mandate of any operation or to the termination of such operation.

At a time when we are all trying to reach agreement about the best means of reforming the Security Council's procedures and methods of work and of increasing its membership, the improvement and development of the arrangements of consultation between the Council and the troop-contributing countries for peace-keeping operations is but an important step towards greater democratization of the work of the Council and the enhancement of the efficacy of its resolutions.

The President *(interpretation from Russian)*: I thank the representative of Egypt for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of New Zealand. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Keating (New Zealand): My congratulations go to you, Mr. President, and also to Ambassador Al-Khussaiby, the President of the Council last month.

It will come as no surprise to anybody in this room that my delegation endorses 100 per cent the proposals put forward this morning by Ambassador Cárdenas, on behalf of a large number of countries.

I will not repeat any of the points made by Ambassador Cárdenas, but I do want to say a few words about the reasons why we have been disappointed at the outcome of last year's presidential statement, of 4 November, and also a few words in response to some of the concerns that have been expressed by previous speakers here this morning.

The new procedures that were put in place last year were widely welcomed. Some of the meetings which have been held under these new procedures have clearly demonstrated the benefit and the need for better consultation, and in that regard we would like to warmly commend some of the Council members for trying to make the new arrangements work. But we fear that for the most part Council members and the Secretariat have treated the meetings as essentially briefing sessions for the non-members. In general, Council members have seen no need to speak; some do not even attend. In reality, the process has been consultative only in name.

The practice, therefore, does not match up to the expectations raised by the 4 November 1994 presidential statement. I would also recall that that statement foreshadowed an expected schedule of consultative meetings at the beginning of each month. Unfortunately, only pro forma references appear in the Council's tentative programme of work. We do not feel that this is sufficient. Similarly, there were to be background papers circulated, indicating the topics to be covered, and they were to be circulated well in advance of each meeting with the troop contributors. This does not happen. Most meetings, as many have commented this morning, take place at very short notice; they are unstructured and have no discernible outcome. Under these circumstances, it would be surprising if any reports received by the Council President, who is required to report back to the Council on these consultations, could be very informative. Indeed, as the representative of the United States mentioned this morning, this is another element of the November 1994 statement which is observed more often in the lapse.

In the light of this experience, therefore, New Zealand considers it is timely for the Council to live up to its undertaking to reopen this matter and to pursue enhanced arrangements in open dialogue with troop contributors. We welcome this first step today in a formal Council meeting, and we would propose that the next step should be for the Council to agree that an informal joint working group should be established, involving the members of the Council and those troop contributors who wish to participate in informal discussions of how best to ensure progress on this issue. We believe that this is a procedural issue — not a matter of substance — and one on which it would be appropriate to take an innovative approach. We note from the statements made in the Security Council today, in the plenary General Assembly and in the debate on peace-keeping operations in the Fourth Committee that a serious review of this sort would be widely welcomed. It would demonstrate the Council's awareness of its responsibilities towards Member States and, equally, it would show that the Council can take a lead in the search for improved effectiveness, efficiency and reform. Such a lead would be a critical contribution from the Council as we all deliberate in this anniversary year on wider United Nations reform.

I would like at this point to make a few brief comments about some of the reservations which have been raised in the debate so far this morning.

First, I noted the concern expressed by the representative of France about establishing new separate groups of Member States. That, of course, is a valid concern. It would be more valid, however, if Article 44 of the Charter did not already recognize the existence of a particular group of Member States that can and does make special contributions to international peace and security.

Secondly, the Permanent Representative of France recalled France's proposal for further orientation meetings. New Zealand was the first member of the Council to support France's initiative in this respect. And we do strongly urge that this practice be reinvigorated in the new year. But it seems to me that that practice is precisely one which provides an opportunity to participate for those Members of the United Nations that have no other opportunity to make a contribution. There is a special contribution that can be made by troop contributors.

The representative of France also expressed concern about the prerogatives of the Secretary-General.

I think it needs to be said that there is a very important issue here. Where we have genuine peace-keeping operations in a benign environment, the

traditional peace-keeping model, it is true that the Member States have little need to participate, and little interest in participating, in the day-to-day running of the peace-keeping operation — and that is as it should be. But the situation, as several colleagues have indicated this morning, can be, and is, very different where peace-keeping forces are inserted into a situation of active hostilities. The cases of Somalia, of Bosnia, of Rwanda, have all been cited by various members of the Council, and we all know that the practical reality is that where peace-keeping forces are engaged in a situation where there is active hostility, the Governments of Member States regard themselves as being very much accountable to their parliaments for what happens in the day-to-day operations of those peace-keeping situations.

There are two ways of involving representatives of Member States in such important decisions that need to be taken, decisions that are often of great moment and consequence both for the peace-keeping operation itself and for the lives of the soldiers on the ground. One is that they be taken behind the scenes through informal, non-existent, non-institutional processes. The other is that they be taken in a clearly open and transparent process that involves all of those who have serious interests engaged, and that is the Security Council, which has the final responsibility to decide, and the troop-contributing countries, which have a responsibility to have and to contribute input to that decision.

From what we have seen in Somalia, from what we have seen in Bosnia and from my own personal experience as President of the Security Council in April of last year during the crisis in Rwanda, when I convened meetings of troop contributors on a daily basis simply to ensure that we actually had an operation that would continue, it seems to me that it has been critically demonstrated that the Member States that are troop contributors do make the difference between the success or non-existence of a peace-keeping operation, and that structured consultations with those troop contributors are of critical importance. It seems to me that this is a classic example of how it should be continued in the future.

I should like to conclude by offering a few thoughts about what I believe is a long and respectable tradition of concern for participation by troop contributors in decisions. I have heard the reservations raised about institutionalization or the establishment of new institutions for participation in this regard. I think that I recall that as far back as 1215 a very important event took place. The Magna Carta is best remembered as a compact that began the evolution of parliamentary democracy. But, while all that is true, it seems to me that in 1215 the most important common element among the barons who gathered at Runnymede on the banks of the Thames was that they were troop contributors and that they wanted an institution in which they could participate in decisions about the deployment of their troops.

I can imagine that in that very difficult situation King John, who had a royal court that may be compared to this Council, made all the same argument as some have made today: that there should be no new institution or no new subsidiary organ. He would have argued that his operational effectiveness would have been impaired. He would have argued that his Royal Council would not have been able to respond quickly if it had to stop and consult with the troop contributors. But King John was swimming against the tide of history, and we feel that the same historical tide is flowing very strongly here in the United Nations at the end of this century and that it is time for change and time for genuine, substantive change.

In making this somewhat flippant comment, I do not want to paint any members of the Council — and certainly not you, Mr. President — in the role of Bad King John, so I take this opportunity to wish you and all of the members of the Council a happy Christmas and a peaceful New Year.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of New Zealand for his kind words addressed to me — in particular for his kindness in not comparing me to King John.

The next speaker is the representative of Spain. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Yáñez-Barnuevo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, Spain was one of the signatories of the collective letter addressed to you on 11 December by the representatives of 34 Member States, requesting this formal public meeting of the Security Council. The broad support given that initiative, as well as the long list of delegations inscribed to speak in this debate, are clear evidence of the interest that exists in the subject which we are discussing and which, curiously enough, does not explicitly appear in the agenda for this meeting. I refer, of course, to consultations between members of the Security Council and troop contributors to peace-keeping operations.

Following the adoption of the presidential statement of 4 November 1994 (S/PRST/1994/62), significant progress has been made in the processes for exchange of information between members of the Security Council, on the one hand, and Member States as a whole, on the other, in particular the countries contributing troops to peace-keeping operations. In spite of the progress achieved, we believe — and this has emerged clearly in today's debate — that current procedures have proved insufficient and that thus, in light of past experience, new procedures are needed.

We have exchanged ideas and opinions with other delegations from different regional groups. A result of those contacts is the statement made at the beginning of this meeting by the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Cárdenas — a statement whose content we support and which, as we understand it, reflects the feelings of a large and significant number of Member States of the Organization. I should also like to support in general terms the comments made during the meeting by a series of delegations, in particular those just offered by the Permanent Representative of New Zealand, Ambassador Keating.

There is undoubtedly a need for intensification and greater institutionalization of consultations between members of the Council and the countries contributing troops to peace-keeping operations. It is not a question of thereby blurring the respective roles of the Security Council and troop-contributing States. Nevertheless, the smooth functioning and effectiveness of peace-keeping operations require increased cooperation on the part of all involved. I do not want to dwell on the arguments already put forward, but I would like to elaborate on one aspect which, in my opinion, requires special consideration.

Peace-keeping operations are not ends in themselves — they are instruments to manage and resolve conflicts. In this respect, we believe that the consultations of the Council's members should not be limited to troop-contributing countries, but should include other countries that are particularly interested in finding a political solution to a given conflict or situation. This already occurs in the membership of the groups of friends of the Secretary-General for a given peace process. Depending on the specific case, the members of such groups may or may not participate as contributors to the respective peace-keeping operation. This idea was partially reflected in the Security Council's presidential statement of 4 November 1994 and should be further developed.

In any case, we believe that the entire membership of the United Nations should be more closely associated with the work of the Security Council, thereby enhancing the legitimacy of its actions and, ultimately, of its effectiveness.

We hope that the members of the Security Council will take into due consideration the expectations and aspirations broadly shared by the rest of the States Members of the Organization as regards the intensification of consultations and the exchange of information on the development of peace-keeping operations. This in no way affects the responsibilities of the Security Council, which, in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter, acts on behalf of all Member States in carrying out its duties in the maintenance of international peace and security.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Australia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Rowe (Australia): Australia welcomes the convening of this meeting of the Security Council to consider ways of improving consultations between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries. As one of 34 Member States that jointly forwarded a letter to you, Sir, as President of the Security Council, we should like to express our appreciation to you for promptly scheduling this meeting on the Council's agenda.

Australia has worked closely with a large group of other Member States to develop common approaches to the best means by which the consultation process between the Security Council and troop contributors can be improved. Australia fully associates itself with the statement of the Permanent Representative of Argentina on how this can be achieved. We are pleased to have worked closely with so many other interested countries in order to find solutions to some of the current shortcomings in the consultation process.

In recent years, growing concern has been expressed about the need to improve the consultation mechanisms between the Security Council and troop contributors and more broadly with the overall United Nations membership. Last year, Argentina and New Zealand, supported by a large number of countries, including my own, initiated a much-needed process of reform on this issue.

Since that time, we have been pleased to see instances in which the Security Council has listened to Member States and has itself sought to respond to calls for change. The consultative process set out in the presidential statement of 4 November 1994 was a welcome development. But even at that time, the Council envisaged that the consultative process outlined in the presidential statement would require review and reassessment in the light of experience, as would the arrangements to improve the quality and speed of flow of information available to support the Council's decision-making.

It is of the utmost importance to the health of this Organization that Security Council decisions be fully implemented and complied with and that the ability and authority of the Security Council to respond to threats to international peace and security be strengthened and incontrovertible. Among others, troop contributors play an indispensable and integral part in putting into effect the decisions of the Council and hence are seeking to cooperate with the Council for a common purpose, namely, the implementation of effective peace-keeping operations.

To achieve this, a timely and genuine process of consultations between troop contributors and the Council is imperative. This has been acknowledged in a number of forums, including by the Council in the presidential statement of 3 May 1994, in which it stated:

> "The Security Council is conscious of the need for enhanced consultations and exchange of information with troop-contributing countries regarding peace-keeping operations, including their planning, management and coordination, particularly when significant extensions in an operation's mandate are in prospect." (*S/PRST/1994/22, p. 3*)

We are firmly of the view that improving and formalizing the consultation mechanism between troop contributors and the Security Council are among the measures necessary to improve the coordination, management and planning of peace-keeping operations. This is one of the measures that will respond to the lessons we have learned from recent United Nations peace-keeping operations. The past few years have given us examples of peace-keeping operations and mandates that have been driven by the need to be seen to be doing something, that have not been achievable in the field or that have lacked the clarity about the goals and operation which commanders could reasonably expect. We have seen missions undertaken without provision of the necessary resources and the assumption of a role in complex situations where there has been insufficient coordination between Blue Helmet forces and other international actors, whether these be regional organizations, non-governmental aid bodies or United Nations organs or agencies.

We have also seen the inability to deploy forces quickly when a crisis is emerging. It took many months before the Security Council's decision to enlarge the United Nations Protection Force to protect safe havens in Bosnia was actually put into effect and even then on a scale that was inadequate to the task. We also remain agonizingly conscious of the failure to react in time to prevent the genocide in Rwanda.

An enhancement of the consultation process between the Security Council and troop contributors, as well as of the strategic and operational planning capacity of the United Nations, will generate confidence in this Organization's capability and lead to Member States being more prepared to deliver military units for operations established by the Council.

Let me be clear: the mechanism outlined by Argentina should not be construed as a means of limiting or interfering with the authority or prerogatives of the Security Council. We envisage that such a consultative mechanism would be achieved by way of a resolution of the Security Council, given the importance of the matter and the need to formalize such a mechanism. To this end, we endorse the proposal made today by the Permanent Representative of New Zealand for the holding of informal consultations between the Security Council and interested Member States on appropriate measures.

Consideration by the Council of the perspectives of Member States, particularly those most affected by a matter on the Council's agenda, is a *sine qua non* for the deliberations of the Council. It is important to reflect on Article 24 of the Charter, under which the Council acts on behalf of Member States. Article 24 implies the Council's responsibility to draw on the views of the wider membership of the United Nations on all aspects of its work. Its role as an effective representative body demands at least this.

The consultation mechanism we envisage will be important in developing the culture and methodology for identifying and responding to situations that threaten international peace and security and will also improve the means by which the Security Council relates to the general membership of the United Nations.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Fowler (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): Times change, and institutions must adapt to change. This is the subject of our debate today.

In the field of peace-keeping, the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries must work closely together. If Member States are not willing to participate in operations that are decided on and renewed by the Council, there will be no peace-keeping.

It is therefore reasonable to expect the Council to be aware, before taking decisions, of the military resources and political support forthcoming from Member States. It is equally important for troop-contributing countries, before taking decisions regarding their own commitments, to discuss with members of the Council the options under consideration for mandate and force structure. Today's debate reflects a somewhat curious situation: troop-contributing countries are again before the members of the Security Council to plead for more formal and more complete consultations. Is this not in our best mutual interests?

My delegation associates itself fully with the ideas formulated by a number of troop contributors, as expressed by the Permanent Representative of Argentina. We warmly congratulate Argentina on its initiative and efforts. Thirty-four countries officially requested the holding of this debate, the purpose of which is to examine ways in which the existing consultative mechanisms can be strengthened. We note with satisfaction that three permanent members of the Council, by associating themselves with the letter requesting a debate, have clearly reaffirmed their endorsement of this objective.

(spoke in English)

In our view, the consultations held in pursuance of the implementation of the presidential statement of 4 November 1994 have been of some use to troop contributors, as well as, we hope, to members of the Council. They have provided a forum for frank exchanges of views, even if troop contributors have not always availed themselves of that opportunity. Much remains to be done to make these consultations more effective. The sensible proposals enunciated by Argentina, if adopted by the Council, would undoubtedly achieve this result. We strongly believe that the implementation of these proposals would improve the United Nations handling of peace and security issues.

Canada attaches particular importance to some of these proposals. We strongly believe that a distinction needs to be drawn between the discussion of political and mandate issues, on the one hand, and of operational issues, on the other. The former are the concern of the Council and should be discussed directly with it; the latter are the responsibility of the Secretariat and need to be addressed between it and troop contributors. The current process of joint Secretariat and Council chairmanship of meetings with troop contributors tends to confuse political and operational issues. Consultations with the Security Council on mandate issues should therefore be chaired by the Council, with the Secretariat present as a matter of course.

We also wish to highlight, in the context of enhancing the United Nations rapid-reaction capability, the need for the Council to consult potential troop contributors, identified by the Secretariat, before launching and operation. Such a measure, combined with the establishment of a standing, deployable headquarters involved in contingency planning, would give the Council confidence that its decisions could be implemented quickly and effectively.

I cannot leave this subject without making a few further comments about the decision-making process of the Council. No consultation procedure agreed by the Council will work if the members of the Council do not seriously take into account the advice offered by troop contributors and by the Secretariat.

As I noted on 12 December, during the debate on the renewal of the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR), the Council seems overly inclined to take decisions about peace-keeping operations which are sometimes ambiguous, decisions which have not always been fully thought out or which are based on incomplete information. Too often, such decisions seem to be motivated by short-term political expediency rather than by a careful consideration of all relevant factors. This has resulted in difficulties we are all aware of and has seriously impaired the credibility of our Organization.

Mandates agreed by the Council must be clear and implementable. They cannot be dissociated from the force structures necessary to carry them out. To do otherwise is to court disaster, and we have seen enough of that to know this to be the case.

We would argue that the Security Council has two choices regarding peace-keeping operations. The first, which is obviously the more desirable, is to ensure, through careful, methodical decision-making, that the United Nations response is fully adequate, politically and militarily, to meet the exigencies of the situation at hand. All the resources agreed to be necessary must be available to implement the decisions taken. The second option, if the United Nations cannot marshal adequate resources, is to do nothing. The era of half-hearted, under-resourced and ill-defined operations should now be over. Effective consultations with troop contributors, we believe, can help ensure that this will be the case.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): There are still a number of speakers on the list. In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend, with the concurrence of the members of the Council, to suspend the meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 1.15 p.m. and resumed at 4.20 p.m.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I now call on the representative of Malaysia.

Mr. Yoogalingam (Malaysia): Sir, I am honoured to see you continue to preside over this Council for the month of December.

I also wish to acknowledge the role played by Argentina in facilitating the debate before this Council on the important subject of improving consultations between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries.

Malaysia has been at the forefront of this issue, given our deep involvement in and our commitment to United Nations peace-keeping in all its aspects.

The subject of consultations between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries on peace-keeping operations is not new. Serious discussions on this issue have been going on within and outside the United Nations, including with reference to the operationalization of Article 44 which, among other things, provides for a Member State not represented in the Council, and I quote:

> "to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces."

The issue of consultations came to a head at a time when the Security Council was taking decisions pertaining to the United Nations peace-keeping operations in Somalia, particularly at a stage when the troop-contributing countries were all from the South, with virtually no representation in the Council. Mandates for the operations changed, while troop contributors had no input to the decisions of the Council. Although Somalia has been put on the back burner, the issue of consultations has remained relevant, continuing to this day.

Following initiatives taken by my own country, Canada, and the Netherlands, to name but a few, the Argentine and New Zealand delegations successfully steered through this Council in November 1994 a presidential statement which called for consultations among the Security Council, the troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat. Consequently, informal consultations commenced among members of the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries concerning peace-keeping operations.

In our view, the current practice of consultations, following the Security Council's decision on 4 November 1994, remains ad hoc in nature and unsatisfactory in practice. What took place was more like a briefing than a consultation as was originally envisaged. Its ad hoc and overlapping schedule has resulted in some members with small missions being deprived of the opportunity to attend and participate meaningfully and constructively in these meetings. Often, queries raised by Member States at these briefings were not responded to with adequate and satisfactory answers. In short, there are still weaknesses in the practice of consultations.

Obviously, the shortcomings inherent in the current mechanism for consultations cannot be left uncorrected. It was with this point in mind that we stated in the plenary of the General Assembly on 13 November 1995, during the debate on the reform of the Security Council, that it was high time for Article 44 of the Charter, which provides for troop-contributing countries to participate in the decisions of the Council, to be put into operation.

The initiative, marshalled by Argentina and other like-minded countries, including Malaysia, whereby the institutionalization of a mechanism of consultations was proposed deserves early implementation. Malaysia fully supports the call for the establishment of a subsidiary organ as provided for in Article 29 of the Charter to facilitate these consultations. My delegation is also open to other options which would effectively provide for these consultations.

Only through a formal consultative process could members of the Security Council and troop-contributing countries contribute positively to accurate preparation and assessment before the Security Council modifies, extends and terminates the mandates of existing operations or decides on the mandates of new missions. The complexity and multidimensional nature of peace-keeping operations further reinforces the need for more institutionalized meetings between the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop contributors. Such meetings could usefully facilitate the identification and discussion of problems at an early stage.

While it is understood that troop-contributing countries will be members of this formalized mechanism, my delegation is also of the view that resource-contributing countries should be recognized, in addition to countries in which operations are being carried out. However, one must not lose sight of the fact that countries contributing troops have to undertake even heavier risks than those providing only financial and material support. In the case of a new operation, potential troop- and resource-contributing countries, along with the country where the outbreak of conflict is impending, must be drafted as members of the formalized mechanism.

In the case of existing operations, it is worthwhile to consider the presence of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and/or field commander. Their presence at these consultations would facilitate members with a first-hand account of the situation in the field which members of the Security Council or the Secretariat could not provide.

To enable all the countries involved to participate in the consultation process productively and constructively, it is imperative that meetings should be scheduled only tentatively; more important, the schedule must be coordinated to avoid overlapping which might prevent the attendance of the members involved, especially those with small representation.

It must be emphasized that the effort to have the consultative mechanism between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries institutionalized must not — and should not — be misconstrued as an attempt by troop-contributing countries to interfere and undermine the jurisdiction and authority of the Security Council. Nor should it be seen as a way to overburden the already heavy work of the Council. It should, however, be viewed in the context of the willingness of non-members to supplement and complement the decision-making process of the Security Council on peace-keeping operations.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Malaysia for his statement and kind words addressed to me.

I now invite the representative of Tunisia to take a seat at the Council table.

Mr. Abdellah (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Allow me first to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. Your outstanding qualities as an experienced diplomat guarantee the success of the Council's work.

I should like also to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Al-Khussaiby of the Sultanate of Oman, for the exemplary manner in which he presided over the work of the Council last month.

Allow me also, Mr. President, to convey to you my delegation's thanks for convening this meeting on the question of consultations between members of the Security Council and troop-contributing countries.

In addition, I want to thank the authors of the letter of 8 December 1995 for their initiative, which my delegation fully endorses.

The issue before us today is of particular significance to my country, which has contributed to many peace-keeping operations since the 1960s, and continues to do so.

In the past few years there has been an unprecedented expansion of peace-keeping operations, requiring an increasing number of troops. The personnel involved in these operations find themselves at greater and greater risk because the nature of the operations has changed and they now entail new and varied tasks. This development means increased responsibilities not only for the Security Council and the Secretariat of the United Nations but also for countries non-members of the Council, which are called upon more often. Though they are accountable at the national level both for the security of personnel provided for peace-keeping operations and for the costs involved, countries non-members of the Council that contribute troops do not take part in the decisions affecting these operations. Consequently, these countries feel rather frustrated. They have legitimate grounds for asking for a redefinition of the nature of their relationship with the members of the Security Council.

The presidential statement of the Security Council dated 4 November 1994 responds in part to this request, in that it provides for the possibility of meetings between troop-contributing countries, the Secretariat and the members of the Council for the purpose of facilitating exchanges of information and views before the Council takes a decision on the extension, modification or termination of the mandate of any given operation. These meetings supplement those already organized by the Secretariat, which are attended by troop-contributing countries and by a force commander or a special representative of the Secretary-General.

When these measures were introduced, my country welcomed them. However, in practice, their limitations and omissions have shown up. The meetings held so far with the Secretariat and members of the Council have consisted primarily of a statement by the troop-contributing countries of their concerns about issues related to the main aspects of peace-keeping operations, without any real dialogue between those countries and the members of the Security Council. Moreover, the meetings confine themselves to operations already under way; they do not relate to operations that are being considered. In some cases the time available before the Council's adoption of a decision is insufficient. Lastly, the meetings are not held automatically.

Associating itself fully with the statement made this morning by Ambassador Cárdenas of Argentina, my delegation believes that these inadequacies could be overcome through the adoption of the following measures.

The meetings could be institutionalized, so that they would take place periodically and regularly.

The meetings should allow for more direct contact between Council members and troop-contributing countries that are non-members of the Council and should focus on important issues relating, in particular, to the mandate of an operation, its implementation and its renewal and, in more general terms, to the planning, management and coordination of the operation throughout its duration.

These discussions could be held within a subsidiary organ, or several such bodies, set up by the Security Council under Article 29 of the Charter.

Consultations should also be held with potential troop-contributing countries on operations that the Security Council is considering setting up.

Within this new framework of institutionalized and focused consultations, the Secretariat could be encouraged to provide the maximum possible information and, particularly, to submit reports on the difficult situations encountered by some operations.

The effective participation of troop-contributing countries in Security Council decisions on the establishment of peace-keeping operations, their mandate and their implementation will to a great extent determine the success of the Organization in the area of peace-keeping — an area in which the Organization must continue its efforts. The implementation of these proposals, with which a large number of troop-contributing countries agree, would help to strengthen the confidence of countries non-members of the Council in the Council's actions and would thereby help ensure those countries' willingness to participate, or to continue to participate, in peace-keeping operations.

In addition, the establishment of this new mechanism for exchanges between the Security Council and non-members would allow for more informed decision-making and better conduct of all aspects of the operations and would not infringe upon the Council's prerogatives in this area.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Tunisia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Norway. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Biørn Lian (Norway): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries — Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and my own country, Norway.

Allow me first of all, in my brief statement, to express our appreciation to you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting and to commend the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Emilio Cárdenas, for the initiative he took to bring about this very timely follow-up to the mechanism established through the presidential statement of last year.

The Nordic countries fully associate themselves with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Argentina, summarizing the discussions which have taken place among a number of interested countries and outlining the features we believe should characterize a

strengthened and improved mechanism for consultations between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries.

The Members of the United Nations have conferred primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security on the Security Council. But it is a shared responsibility for all Member States to make sure that the Security Council has at its disposal the necessary means as well as the necessary support to carry out its task.

The Nordic countries have been, and remain, among the most important troop contributors to the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations. It is the same, long-standing commitment to this essential task which is reflected when we stress the need to strengthen the arrangements for consultations between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries on peace-keeping operations. We must aim at arrangements which will contribute to a strengthened support for the Security Council in the performance of its duties, to a more precise formulation of mandates for the operations and to an improved perception and understanding by troop contributors of these mandates.

Allow me also to underline in this context the need we feel, as very substantial contributors to the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations, for a mechanism for troop contributors to communicate, on a regular basis, their concerns, ideas and experiences to members of the Security Council and the Secretariat. This would bring us closer to the decision-making of the Security Council, which in turn would contribute to ensuring continued support from our public opinion and from our home authorities in these important matters.

The Nordic countries welcomed the steps that were taken in this respect last year, and have certainly found consultations that have ensued very useful. We trust that this is also the view of the Security Council itself. It is now time to review the mechanism and to look at ways to further develop it, along the lines that have been drawn up by the representative of Argentina.

Let me focus on two aspects which the Nordic countries consider to be of particular importance. These two aspects have already been touched upon by a number of previous speakers in this debate.

First, the establishment of a forum for consultations for troop contributors will, we feel, lead to more efficient and effective decision-making and management with respect to peace-keeping operations. We are of the view that this mechanism should preferably be institutionalized as a subsidiary organ under Article 29 of the Charter. This would ensure regular and formalized consultations, which is essential for this matter of crucial concern to the international community.

Secondly, in addition to the arrangements already decided by the Council, it is important that consultations with potential contributors should also take place before decisions are taken to launch new operations. Thus, we feel, the Council as well as the potential troop contributors will be in a better position to assess realistically which options are available and to decide on the course of action to be taken. The Permanent Representative of New Zealand commented very effectively, I feel, on the reservations expressed, in particular, by France on this point.

It is our firm belief that an institutionalized mechanism with these features, and taking care of these concerns, is in the interest of the Security Council itself and the troop-contributing countries, and that it will contribute in a very positive manner to what must remain our overall objective: the enhancement of the capacity of the Security Council — and thus of the United Nations — to maintain international peace and security.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Ireland. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Campbell (Ireland): Let me, too, offer you my congratulations, Mr. President. My delegation warmly welcomes the decision to convene this special meeting of the Security Council.

My delegation wishes firstly to associate itself with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Cárdenas, outlining a number of suggestions put forward by various troop-contributing countries, including Ireland, on how the existing consultation procedures might be developed. We appreciate very much this initiative taken by the delegation of Argentina.

As a troop-contributing country of long standing, Ireland believes that it is only right and appropriate that Member States which contribute military and civilian personnel to United Nations peace-keeping operations

should have an input into vital decisions concerning those peace-keeping missions in which their personnel contribute.

The need for an effective process of consultation is also evident in the light of recent peace-keeping and peacemaking experience. The operations in Somalia, Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia have shown the need for new procedures to ensure greater political support and confidence within Member States for the peace-keeping and peace-building role and activities of the United Nations. This can only be achieved through improved information flows and greater transparency as to the rationale and purposes of United Nations peace-keeping missions.

Ireland has also supported the strengthening of consultation procedures in the context of efforts to reform and improve the working procedures of the Security Council. There has already been considerable progress in making the Council's working methods more transparent. We believe that this could be further facilitated and the Council's overall relationship with the general membership strengthened through additional measures to develop the troop consultation procedures which exist.

My delegation warmly welcomed the initiative taken by the Security Council in November last year to place the then existing consultation procedures on a more assured footing. We supported this initiative as an important first step towards meeting the concerns of troop contributors and putting in place an institutionalized series of arrangements for such consultation.

In reviewing the operation of the consultation procedures instituted in November last year, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that, while they have brought improvements, they have not worked as effectively as one would have hoped. The responsibility for this situation cannot solely be attributed to any one of the participants in the process. The success of any consultation procedures can only be guaranteed if there is active and full involvement by all who are given the opportunity.

At the same time, insufficient account appears to have been taken of the fact that the existing consultation procedures were not intended to cover every single situation where it is necessary for troop contributors to be consulted. Operational-level meetings, chaired by the Secretariat, still have a part to play in the consultation process. Part of the difficulties experienced in the past year might have been avoided with a better balance in the form of consultation procedure employed.

My delegation also feels, like others, that troop-contributing meetings are too frequently convened at a stage when the process of informal consultations within the Council has virtually been completed. It follows that views expressed are unlikely to have a significant impact on the decisions eventually adopted by the Council. This does not appear to be in conformity with the intention stated in the presidential statement of 4 November 1994 that such meetings should be held "in good time" (*S/PRST/1994/62, p. 1*) before the Council moves to take action.

Nor has the scope for meaningful input by troop contributors into the decision-making process, through the provision of views at an early stage in the informal consultation process, been facilitated by the lack of documentation provided at troop-contributor meetings. This again is hardly consistent with the commitment made in November 1994 to make available an informal paper, including relevant background documentation, to troop contributors well in advance of meetings.

It is in part for these reasons that my delegation believes that there should be a review of the existing consultation procedures by the Council, with a view to seeing how they could be further strengthened to allow for a more meaningful input by troop contributors into the decisions the Council takes on the conduct and purposes of United Nations peace missions. In this regard, as I have said, we fully support the series of proposals and ideas developed in the earlier statement by the Permanent Representative of Argentina. We believe that these proposals are fully in line with the type of pragmatic development of the existing procedures foreshadowed at the time they were instituted. My Government has also noted and welcomed the valuable proposals which the Government of Canada has recently made on how troop-consultation procedures might be improved and believes that these proposals are also worthy of serious consideration.

My delegation believes that the ultimate objective of efforts to enhance the process of communication and consultation between troop contributors and the Security Council should be the establishment of a specific subsidiary organ of the Security Council for this purpose. This would provide a more orderly and effective framework for dialogue. With proper channelling of information, it would facilitate greater Security Council awareness of troop contributors' views. It would offer troop contributors more systematic opportunities to convey their views on policy formation with respect to

peace operations, in terms both of the definition of general goals and of the provision of direction for specific operations. We believe that the establishment of such an organ would be fully consistent with the Charter since it is provided for in Article 29. Nor do we believe that the establishment of a subsidiary organ would impinge in any way on the existing competencies or prerogatives of the Council. On the contrary, we feel that it would greatly assist the Security Council to better fulfil its ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, through ensuring a greater level of political support for and understanding of the Council's actions among Member States.

To conclude, Ireland hopes that this meeting, and the ideas emerging from it, will encourage the members of the Security Council to conduct a full review of the procedures provided for in the presidential statement of 4 November 1994 and come forward with some new proposals on how they might be further enhanced. New Zealand's procedural proposal today in this context is also worth considering. As an active troop contributor, we are anxious that the dialogue between troop contributors and Council members on this subject should be positive and constructive. We are convinced that if such is the case the end result will be a more effective Council as well as a more effective implementation of its mandates.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Austria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Manz (Austria): In adding our voice to those of the other troop-contributing countries that have requested you to call this formal meeting, Mr. President, we wanted to underline two things. First, we are convinced that the consultation mechanism put in place a little more than a year ago was an important step in the right direction. And, secondly, we strongly feel that the experience gained during the past year clearly points to the need to improve our performance.

I should like to stress that it is our common performance that has to improve. It is not only the mechanism established by the presidential statement of 4 November 1994 as such that limits the dialogue between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries, although there are some obvious shortcomings. I have to note that the troop-contributing countries also have perhaps not always made the best use of these opportunities, allowing these meetings to remain little more than briefing sessions. While it is undoubtedly true that most of these meetings were called at a late stage, when the Council and the Secretariat had already finalized their deliberations, in most cases the troop contributors could have certainly done better in engaging the Security Council presidency and the Secretariat in a substantial debate. Let me add, however, that we always appreciated the accurate information we received from the Secretariat as well as its readiness to respond to our questions.

We are firmly committed to United Nations peace-keeping efforts. More than 35,000 Austrians have worn Blue Helmets over the years. We are currently engaged in nine peace-keeping operations. We remain convinced that peace-keeping operations are among the finest tools to fulfil the goals of the Charter.

It is the primary responsibility of the Security Council to make sure that it has a full picture of the situation and the views of all parties involved in a peace-keeping operation before arriving at particular decisions. Having itself served on the Council only a few years ago, Austria is aware of the need to safeguard the competencies of the Security Council. But every troop-contributing country has a legitimate interest in having its views considered by the Council when pending decisions on a peace-keeping operation might affect its citizens serving the United Nations. For this purpose, the present mechanism needs improvement.

We therefore fully support the proposals worked out by a substantial number of troop-contributing countries as presented this morning in the statement by the Permanent Representative of Argentina.

Given the workload of the Security Council, we should look for the most efficient as well as the most effective way to organize such meetings. But let there be no doubt that we feel very strongly about the need to strengthen the partnership between the Council and the troop-contributing countries in our common interest.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Pakistan. I invite the representative of Pakistan to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Kamal (Pakistan): Since this is the first time that I have addressed the Council under your presidency, Sir, let me congratulate you on your assumption of your onerous responsibilities and express the conviction that in its deliberations the Council will benefit from your experience. I would also like to express our admiration

for the manner in which your predecessor, the Ambassador of Oman, conducted the business of the Council during his presidency.

Pakistan supports the need for a more formal and institutionalized mechanism of consultations between troop contributors and the Security Council with the aim of creating the broadest possible support among Member States for peace-keeping operations of the Security Council. We are confident that under your able guidance, Mr. President, the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries will continue to engage in a constructive dialogue.

Pakistan has always closely followed and actively participated in the deliberations on peace-keeping. We have done so because we consider it to be extremely important that the United Nations act whenever peace is threatened and that it act before the outbreak of a conflict rather than intervening once the conflict has already erupted.

Pakistan, for its part, has actively cooperated and participated in the peace-keeping efforts of the United Nations. At present, Pakistan is the fourth largest troop-contributing country to United Nations peace-keeping operations, with 2,418 personnel participating in United Nations operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, in Croatia, in Haiti, in Georgia, in Iraq-Kuwait, in Angola, in Liberia, in Rwanda and in Western Sahara. Pakistan has also offered an infantry battalion for the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) and two brigades in response to the Secretary-General's proposal for United Nations standby arrangements.

Even after the draw down of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), and in view of its established support for and cooperation in peace-keeping, Pakistan will form part of the Implementation Force (IFOR) by providing a brigade to help maintain peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Pakistan firmly believes that United Nations peace-keeping operations exemplify the sustained political commitment of Member States to the concept of collective security and the maintenance of international peace and security. South Asia itself continues to be a beneficiary of one of the oldest peace-keeping operations, in the form of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP).

Pakistan thus supports all initiatives and mechanisms which further ensure the efficient and effective implementation of peace-keeping operations. A system of prior consultations between members of the Security Council, prospective troop-contributing countries and the United Nations Secretariat should be institutionalized. Moreover, there should be no alteration in the mandate, character and duration of peace-keeping operations without proper and complete consultations between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries in an institutionalized mechanism. It is of vital importance that the Council and troop-contributing countries remain seized of an operation at all its stages.

The Security Council, troop contributors and the United Nations Secretariat have made valuable contributions to improve the United Nations capacity in peace-keeping. We are confident that under your able guidance, Mr. President, we will all continue to engage in a constructive dialogue which will further increase peace and harmony among all nations.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Pakistan for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Brazil. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Patriota (Brazil): First of all, I would like to welcome this opportunity to discuss in a formal meeting of the Security Council the relationship between troop-contributing countries and Security Council members. It is with great satisfaction that we participate in a public debate on an issue of such interest to the membership at large, and we hope that the views and suggestions expressed today will be duly recorded and acted upon. We are convinced that under your able guidance, Sir, we will have the possibility of a fruitful deliberation on this item.

I want to express my appreciation to the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Cárdenas, for his active role in bringing about today's debate and his initiative as a whole. I should also like to express our recognition of the role of Ambassador Keating of New Zealand in the launching of this initiative.

This formal session was organized in response to a request made by 34 Member States in a letter addressed to His Excellency the President of the Security Council

In his statement this morning, the Permanent Representative of Argentina named the countries that have been discussing possible ways for improving the coordination between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries.

These countries have reached a general view on what is considered desirable and feasible at this stage in order to foster closer and more focused cooperation between those involved in peace-keeping missions around the world. We endorse the statement by Argentina, and we would like to stress some of the elements that we feel are essential in the handling of the subject.

With the recent increase in the number of peace-keeping operations and their growing complexity, the United Nations has had to face new challenges, with varying degrees of success. On several occasions the Organization has had to recognize its limitations, while on others it has been able to deal creatively with the problems it encountered. In any event, the experience gained in living through difficult situations represents an important asset for facing the uncertainties of the future in the realm of peace-keeping.

In this context, the need for adequate procedures for ensuring the necessary cohesion among troop contributors, Security Council members and the Secretariat cannot be overemphasized.

A Security Council presidential statement issued on 4 November 1994 established the basis for an informal mechanism that has represented a first step in the right direction. The statement itself, however, had the wisdom of recognizing that the arrangements proposed therein should be reviewed in the light of experience. After one year, we feel that the time has come to look at ways to improve the efficiency of these consultations and to fit them into a more predictable framework.

Some measures that have been suggested in this regard deserve serious consideration. A more formal and institutionalized mechanism of consultations is needed. Each consultation meeting should be held well in advance of anticipated Security Council decisions on the extension, modification or termination of the mandate of specific peace-keeping operations. In the establishment of a new peace-keeping operation, the mechanism should allow for consultations with potential troop contributors. Special meetings of the mechanism should be convened in the event of unforeseen developments regarding particular peace-keeping operations that require action by the Council.

In our view, the mechanism for consultations should be chaired by a member of the Security Council for a one-year term. This member could be assisted by other members, as appropriate. The chairman would report to the Council the views expressed by participants in the meetings. The monthly tentative forecast of work of the Council should include an indication of the expected schedule of such meetings.

The support of the Secretariat in the meetings of the mechanism will be of fundamental importance. These meetings should be announced in the *Journal of the United Nations*. The agenda, as well as any relevant information to help troop contributors consider issues under deliberation, should be provided by the Secretariat prior to the meetings.

The meetings arranged by the Secretariat to inform troop contributors on issues related to peace-keeping operations should, in view of their different nature, continue to be held as they are today.

In various United Nations forums, we have been involved in discussions on the issue with a view to strengthening the Organization's role in this field. As a parallel endeavour, and guided by the same overall objectives of today's discussion, we have been encouraging expansion of the membership of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. We remain ready to work with Member States, as well as with the appropriate United Nations organs and the Secretariat, in seeking the best solutions to enhance actions taken under the Charter to further international peace and security.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Brazil for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Luxembourg. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Wolzfeld (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to speak before the Security Council on behalf of the Benelux countries: Belgium, the Netherlands and my country, Luxembourg.

I wish at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for December 1995. I express my appreciation to you for having convened a formal meeting of the Security Council to consider ways to strengthen the current

procedures for consultations between the Council and the countries that contribute troops to peace-keeping operations. In this respect, the Benelux countries fully endorse the statement made this morning by the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Cárdenas.

We recognize that the consultation mechanism launched by the adoption of the presidential statement of 4 November 1994 has made possible improved transparency in the Council's decision-making on peace-keeping operations.

We believe, however, that the modalities of these consultations can and must be improved to achieve a more representative character and greater transparency and efficiency in the decision-making process. The troop-contributing countries should be consulted on a systematic basis, from the very moment a mandate is conceived, before the Council takes any decision on the establishment of a peace-keeping operation. Indeed, peace-keeping operations established by the Security Council will be adequately supported by the contributor States only if their concerns are sufficiently taken into account when mandates are defined and the operations are deployed in the field.

Greater transparency in the Council's decision-making process would have a positive effect on the political commitment of current and future troop contributors. It goes without saying that there is no question of infringing on the Council's spheres of competence or prerogatives.

To our mind, a certain number of improvements would help to make the meetings with the troop contributors more effective. We are thinking of the following measures, *inter alia*: first, meetings should be announced in the *Journal* early enough to allow delegations to prepare themselves adequately. Secondly, the necessary documentation should also be made available to delegations before meetings. Thirdly, the Secretary-General's reports on an operation under consideration should be distributed to the delegations concerned to enable them to study the options suggested by the Secretary-General. Fourthly, consultations with troop contributors should take place on a systematic basis, and early enough to be useful, every time a peace-keeping operation is created, modified, expanded or terminated. Fifthly, records of the meetings with troop contributors should be circulated among all the members of the Council. In order to formalize these modalities for consultation and cooperation, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg believe that the adoption of a formal Security Council resolution would be appropriate.

The Benelux countries hope that this appeal for more institutionalized, effective and representative consultations between troop-contributing countries and the Security Council will be heeded by the Council.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Luxembourg for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Colombia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Londoño-Paredes (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At the outset, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. We know very well that your competence and abilities will mean success for the Council's deliberations.

We are pleased that the Security Council, on the initiative of the delegation of Argentina, is considering the question of consultations between it and countries that contribute troops to peace-keeping operations. This reflects the interest of many other States in this issue. My delegation supports every effort to advance the search for transparency in the work and decisions of the various organs of the Organization, and particularly of the Security Council.

However, we believe that, although the proposed arrangement for consultations is a step in the direction of addressing the urgent need of an efficient coordinating mechanism for troop-contributing countries, it should be seen as an interim measure pending the deeper solution of a broader problem. Such a solution should emerge from the Working Group on the reform of the Council or the Working Group on the Strengthening of the United Nations System.

In deciding to establish the Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council, the Organization recognized the need to enhance transparency within the Security Council. Transparency is essential for ensuring that the Council's decisions have the requisite legitimacy, given their great importance, and transparency will, to a large extent, determine whether the effective and efficient implementation of mandates is viable.

In regard to the proposed consultation mechanism, we have a few comments to make. Although the

mechanism aims at broadening the participation of Member States in the discussions on peace-keeping operations, it also, unfortunately, reinforces the tendency to make them exclusive instruments of the Security Council, thereby marginalizing other main organs of the United Nations. We believe that efforts to enhance transparency in the Council should proceed from the premise that it is necessary to strengthen the role of the General Assembly on issues of international peace and security. It is highly unadvisable to deny an organ authorized to order the deployment of peace-keeping operations the ability to contribute to their success.

As to the Secretariat, we believe it advisable for it to retain the role of Co-Chairman it enjoys in the current arrangement for informal consultations. We see no advantage at all in diminishing the role of the organ responsible for implementing operations. We also believe that, for reasons of cohesion and geographical representativity, it would be advisable for the mechanism to be co-chaired by the President of the Security Council. In the event that this involved an excessive workload for the President, alternatives could be considered. For example, the Co-Chairman could be the State that had occupied the presidency of the Council in the preceding month.

As for the proposal that the consultation mechanism should be a subsidiary organ of the Security Council, it is our view that it is not necessary or advisable to have recourse to Article 29 of the Charter. A mechanism such as the one proposed requires flexibility, and, moreover, nothing would be gained simply by making it more formal. It would be better for a decision of this kind to be taken after the Working Groups have completed their work. The consultations could then be part of a comprehensive package of measures.

Lastly, just as the proposed mechanism provides that its Chairman should report to the Council on the views expressed at each meeting, we believe that he should report also to the General Assembly, and just as regularly.

The President *(interpretation from Russian):* I thank the representative of Colombia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of India. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Shah (India): I begin, Mr. President, by congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December 1995. Your acknowledged diplomatic skills and experience will be a great asset to the Council's work under your presidency.

The Council is considering today an issue that has assumed particular importance following the increased involvement of the United Nations in recent years in peace-keeping operations all over the world. The growing complexity of the operations authorized by the Council requires effective consultations between the Council and troop-contributing countries if the Council's mandates are to be successfully implemented.

The system of consultations, set in motion following the Council's statement of 4 November 1994, were the first concrete manifestation of this requirement. This process has now been in operation long enough for us to review its effectiveness and to consider improvements. As one of the principal troop-contributing countries of the United Nations since its birth, our views would, I trust, be taken into account in a spirit of cooperation and constructive contribution.

With regard to the modalities of the system of consultations with troop contributors, my delegation has found the existing mechanism, involving meetings with troop contributors being co-chaired by the President of the Security Council and the representative of the Secretary-General, quite satisfactory. The Security Council and the Secretary-General are two important agents responsible for the implementation of the Council's decisions. Without the presence of the Secretary-General's representative as Co-Chairman, along with the presidency, the existing balance between political responsibility and operational control, which is so necessary to make such consultations effective, will be missing. We do not believe that granting this task to a subsidiary body of the Council or keeping the Secretary-General's representative on the sidelines will enhance the effectiveness of such consultations.

Notwithstanding our satisfaction over the present modality of consultations, we believe that certain improvements and streamlining will greatly enhance the effectiveness of the Council's decision-making capacity. In our view, consultations should be held on a regular basis and not necessarily just before the mandate is about to expire or needs extension. They should be preceded by the timely provision of detailed reports by the Secretariat. The Secretary-General's report should be available to troop-contributing countries at the same time as it is to

members of the Council, and consultations between Council members and potential troop-contributing countries should take place before the mandate of any new operation is finalized.

It would also be useful to engage in the practice of reviewing, updating or amending mandates of individual peace-keeping operations in a fully transparent manner.

Before concluding, may I take this opportunity to reconfirm India's commitment to continued participation in United Nations peace-keeping operations as part of our traditional support for and continuing commitment to the maintenance of international peace and security, through the United Nations.

The President *(interpretation from Russian)*: I thank the representative of India for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Greece. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Zacharakis (Greece): At the outset, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council for the month of December. I have no doubt that your professional experience and skills will be of invaluable assistance in the conduct of the affairs of the Council. I should also like to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Al-Khussaiby of Oman, for his effective performance of the duties of the office, during the month of November.

My delegation is pleased to have this opportunity to address the Council on the important issue of an improved consultation mechanism between troop-contributing countries and members of the Security Council.

I should like to join all other speakers who emphasized the importance they attach to improving the existing procedures of flow of information and views between members of the Council and countries involved in peace-keeping operations mandated by the Council. We have supported this process as one which is desirable and even inevitable, given the complexity of peace-keeping operations in recent years. Troop-contributing countries have a right to be consulted on the decision-making process on peace-keeping operations in which, through the provision of troops, they have a direct interest.

We firmly believe that intensified dialogue and more regular interaction among all those concerned will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the efforts of the United Nations in the crucial area of peace-keeping.

Therefore we are grateful to Argentina for its initiative to bring about the follow-up to the existing mechanism, which was established by the presidential statement issued on 4 November 1994.

Greece fully associates itself with the statement made by Argentina, which accurately summarizes the discussions and the opinions expressed by a large number of interested delegations on the need to further develop the above mentioned system into a more formal and institutionalized mechanism of consultations.

Without in any way wishing to infringe the authority and prerogatives of the Security Council, but, rather, to contribute to and enhance its credibility, Greece, which, apart from its substantial voluntary contribution to the peace-keeping budget, is currently participating in various peace-keeping operations, has always supported improved consultation procedures in the context of efforts to achieve greater transparency in the operations of the Council. The benefit resulting of such increased transparency will be a generally higher level of political support among Member States for the peace-keeping role and activities of the United Nations. This support is an essential factor in ensuring the continued participation of troops in United Nations peace-keeping operations.

In concluding, I would like to express the hope that the Security Council will adopt a comprehensive resolution on this important issue as soon as possible as a means to further strengthening the consultation procedures with troop-contributing countries concerning both ongoing and future peace-keeping operations.

The President *(interpretation from Russian)*: I thank the representative of Greece for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Çelem (Turkey): On numerous occasions, we have expressed our views on the need to make the Security Council more transparent, responsive, accountable and representative. At meetings of the General Assembly and of the Open-ended Working

Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters Related to the Security Council, as well as at meetings of the Council itself, we have explained our position regarding transparency in and democratization of the Council's decision-making process. During the next round of deliberations of the Open-ended Working Group, we shall continue to address this issue. My delegation strongly believes that openness and democratization in the working methods and procedures of the Security Council will enhance the Council's efficiency and effectiveness.

Under Article 25 of the Charter, Member States agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. This makes the Council unique within the United Nations system. Furthermore, the authority of the Security Council's decisions emanates from the fact that the Council, in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter, acts on behalf of all Members of the United Nations. For that reason, it is essential that the Council's decisions be in accord with the views of the general membership.

The fact that Council decisions must have an adequate consensual basis is also inherent in the letter and spirit of Article 1 (4) of the Charter, which lists "harmonizing the actions of nations" as one of the purposes of the United Nations. Therefore, the creation of a credible and workable mechanism for dialogue between the Council and the general membership is of utmost importance. This would enable the general membership to participate, where and if necessary, in the Council's decision-making process and would ensure greater support for the actions of the Council.

It is in line with this reasoning that we have welcomed and strongly supported all initiatives and steps for achieving transparency. In our letter circulated as document S/1994/1237, we underlined our support for the initiative of Argentina and New Zealand pertaining to the institutionalization of the procedures for consultations between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries. In the same vein, we welcomed the French initiative of 9 November 1994 (S/1994/1279).

The new and improved proposal on institutionalized dialogue between the Council and the troop contributors was outlined in the statement by the representative of Argentina. My delegation, along with many others, associates itself with that statement. We strongly believe that the mechanism proposed by Argentina would contribute to the enhancement of the effectiveness and moral authority of the Council.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Zimbabwe. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sengwe (Zimbabwe): Allow me first to congratulate you warmly, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are confident that your wide experience and well-known diplomatic skills will guide the work of the Council to a successful conclusion. I also express our thanks to your predecessor, Ambassador Salim Bin Mohammed Al-Khussaiby of Oman, for his able stewardship of the Council during the month of November.

We appreciate the efforts Argentina and other interested delegations have made in spearheading discussions on the important topic of consultations between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries. These discussions are a continuation of the 1994 initiative by New Zealand and Argentina on the same subject. It is our understanding that consultations between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries are aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, efficiency and credibility of the Security Council. They complement the work of the Council.

Zimbabwe, as one of the troop contributors, finds the current system of consultations between the Council and troop contributors unsatisfactory; there is certainly room for improvement. Current contacts between the Security Council and troop contributors are more briefings by the Council than consultations on substantive issues pertaining to international peace and security in order to enhance the decision-making process of the Council.

My delegation's position on this and other issues was clearly enunciated in our statement at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly during the debate on reform and restructuring of the Security Council. It is, however, important to observe that, under current practice, it is the Council that decides to launch a peace-keeping operation and that therefore determines the mandate of that peace-keeping operation. Troop contributors emerge only after the mandate has been has been given. Member States thus are not able to influence decisions of the Council during the informal consultations which have become the hallmark of the Council's decision-making mechanism in the post-cold-war period. It is logical therefore to conclude that the general membership, on whose behalf the Council acts, has no

role in determining the mandate. This style of decision-making excludes the entire membership in an era in which the virtues of democracy and transparency are being preached. It is time we implemented Article 44 of the Charter.

My delegation supports the proposal to institutionalize the mechanism of consultations. This would allow Member States to be involved in the decision-making process by providing inputs to help the Security Council make the decision to launch a peace-keeping operation. The involvement of Member States would assist the general membership to understand the nature of the problems in all their aspects, determine the risks involved and assess the duration of a given peace-keeping operation. It would foster the spirit of accountability of the Security Council to the general membership, on whose behalf it acts, as called for in General Assembly resolution 48/264. In our view, the involvement of Member States would enhance the moral authority, prestige and credibility of the Council at a time when it appears that decisions to launch new operations are being made elsewhere.

Having sat on this Council a few years ago, we realize the pressure upon the Council to respond to emergency situations. We are, however, convinced that meaningful consultations by the Security Council would increase the international community's confidence in the Council's capacity to execute, in a judicious and objective manner, its mandate as provided for in the Charter.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Zimbabwe for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Republic of Korea. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Yang Lee (Republic of Korea): At the outset, Sir, I would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. I am confident that your experience and wisdom will enable the Council to discharge its responsibilities effectively. I take this opportunity also to convey my delegation's deep appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Al-Khussaiby of Oman, for his excellent guidance of the Council's work last month.

Turning to the item under discussion, I should like to thank Ambassador Emilio Cárdenas of Argentina for his statement, which conveyed the general sentiments of numerous Member States on the consultations between the Council and the troop-contributing countries and presented some specific proposals for improvements.

As one of the strong supporters of these consultations, the Republic of Korea is pleased to note that the tripartite mechanism has now become a regular feature of the United Nations and has proved useful since it was put into place through the Security Council presidential statement in November of last year. However, we feel compelled to point out that the consultations have also revealed many limitations and shortcomings, some of which I should like briefly to mention here today.

It was often the case that meetings were convened only moments before the expiration of a mandate. My delegation is of the view that such meetings require much better organized preparation and scheduling, as envisaged in the presidential statement.

The briefings at the meetings sometimes offer no new elements additional to those already made available to the troop contributors through the published report of the Secretary-General. Furthermore, the recommendations and views expressed by the troop contributors in the course of these tripartite consultations have not been adequately reflected in subsequent decisions of the Security Council, and for many troop-contributing countries the unpredictability of the fate of their own troops remains a persistent concern.

It is in this context that the Member States have again placed strong emphasis during the current session of the General Assembly on the critical importance of the United Nations peace-keeping operations for the maintenance of global peace and security, and underlined the need to improve the existing arrangements for consultations among troop contributors, the Security Council and the Secretariat.

The Republic of Korea fully recognizes that the Security Council bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and therefore assumes the overall political responsibility for all the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations. However, we must not overlook the fact that the success of the United Nations peace-keeping operations is equally dependent on the active support and participation of the Member States, particularly the troop contributors. It is for this reason that my delegation supports the proposal further to improve the existing mechanism of the

tripartite consultations, through the establishment of a subsidiary organ under Article 29 of the Charter, as suggested in the statement of Ambassador Cárdenas.

Given the limited military planning capability of the United Nations Secretariat, my delegation believes the proposal is particularly pertinent. With such a formal mechanism for consultations in place, the views of the troop contributors could be more clearly conveyed to the Security Council on the operational issues germane to the specific mission, including those of a military nature, so that the Council could make more informed decisions.

My delegation believes that increased transparency and democratization in decision-making, together with an adequate information-sharing system, is of vital importance for maintaining both broad support and a strong mandate, which are considered as the main factors necessary for the success of peace-keeping operations.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of the Republic of Korea for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Rodríguez Parrilla (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to congratulate Oman on its presidency of the Security Council, and I should like also to extend our best wishes to the Russian Federation as it presides over the Council.

Recently the General Assembly devoted two days of plenary meetings to a debate on the report of the Security Council. The list of Member States that participated in the debate was a long one, and the overwhelming majority reaffirmed the principle that one of the main aspects of the overall process of reforming the Security Council was the need for transparency and democratization in the working methods and procedures of this organ.

To that end, some measures and initiatives have been implemented in the last few months. My delegation acknowledges their relevance.

However, despite those measures, there continue to be situations and practices within the Council that must be reviewed and replaced by mechanisms that promote the transparency and democratization required by the nature and functions of this United Nations organ.

The informal meetings of the Security Council, the negotiating forum *par excellence* at which most of this body's work is done, continue to be held behind closed doors, without the participation of the general membership of the Organization, which can then only learn indirectly of the results of these meetings, through the voluntary briefings given by each month's President.

The disparity between the number of formal and informal meetings is increasing. States that are not members of the Council continue to be deprived of any possibility of following those meetings, and documentation and information on what goes on in them continues to be handled with great reticence.

Communication between members and non-members of the Council on decisions relating to peace-keeping operations is still a matter of particular importance to us. The increase in the number, diversity and complexity of those operations and their political and financial implications require their analysis on both an overall and case-by-case basis. But such analysis must above all be transparent, dynamic and timely, and have a practical impact on how the operations are carried out.

The procedure established by the presidential statement of 4 November 1994 on arrangements for holding consultations and for the exchange of information with troop-contributing countries, while a commendable initiative, is not enough. The negotiation and analysis of matters affecting the international community as a whole require more participatory and institutionalized modalities.

Only timely, transparent and democratic discussions and decision-making, allowing for the participation of all Members of the United Nations that are involved or interested, directly or indirectly, in all or some peace-keeping operations will enable the Council and the Organization as a whole to take well-informed, proper decisions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. The present international situation, which is constantly changing, requires — rather than traditional formulas — dynamic and transparent procedures for negotiation and for reaching agreement.

Effective participation by all Member States in decision-making and adequate information on developments will show how transparent our procedures truly are.

No mechanism for information or participation for a group of States can be a substitute for information or participation for all Member States, because the Security Council can only act on behalf of all members when it is carrying out its functions.

We regard as positive the proposal for the possible establishment of a subsidiary organ of the Security Council, which would take up matters relating to consultations between troop contributors and the Council. However, it would be even better if the new mechanism were one with universal participation, through the presence as observers of Member States that do not contribute troops but are interested in the issue. In any event, it is very important for this future subsidiary organ to include all troop contributors at all of its meetings so that they can analyse all operations, some operations or just one particular operation. As our delegation sees it, there would be no point in having a mechanism which would analyse some peace-keeping operations or one specific one only with the participation of those who contribute troops to that or those particular operations.

The Security Council will be able to achieve this as long as its mandate and its actions take account of the provisions of the Charter which provide for equal participation by all Members of this Organization.

It is only when the United Nations has a representative, democratic and transparent Security Council that makes proper use of the powers delegated to it by the Member States that we will have a truly effective Council — effective not only in the area of international peace and security but also able to take up the needs and challenges of the future.

The President (*interpretation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Cuba for his statement and for his kind words addressed to me and my country.

Mr. Cárdenas (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Just very briefly, as we close this debate, I would like to offer a few thoughts prompted by the statements to which we have been listening.

Subsidiary organs are an option which is explicitly provided for in the Charter. It could thus hardly be suggested that the proposal to set up a subsidiary organ implies an institutional reform. On the contrary, this proposal is designed to maximize the possibilities which derive from the constitutional instrument of the United Nations. We can see this clearly from Articles 29 and 44 of the Charter.

Providing an opportunity for Member States to be heard would simply enable the members of the Security Council, before taking decisions for which they are and will continue to be responsible, to hear Member States which belong to this Organization but not at that time to the Council. This would not only enrich the Council; it would enhance its transparency and, as has been said here today, also enhance its representativity.

It seems noteworthy that a category of membership — the most privileged — is suggesting that the initiative we are promoting amount to establishing a new category — that of troop-contributing countries. This is specifically provided for in the Charter. We should recall that the meeting of any organ can always be an open meeting.

To try to get out of the deadlock which we have reached on procedures and in order to improve present procedures we have to believe in openness and to understand and respect the need for transparency. There is no room for extremism. We do not have to fear the views of third parties. We have to hold a vision of the future of the Organization which is more generous than autocratic, understanding that there is no conflict between the desire to listen and the responsibility of taking decisions.

We are very pleased to have heard some delegations speak about the need for a Security Council resolution to implement the proposal. We trust that this will be discussed and eventually agreed to. We feel that this is relevant to the substance of the issue before us, and we do not agree with the intention to immediately downgrade any future juridical instrument, for that would be detrimental to the initiative.

In any case, this philosophy of openness lies behind the kind of meeting we are holding here today. We are discussing an issue in an open forum before we specifically take up this item in the Council itself. Unfortunately, this year, despite the best intentions, we have had only two such meetings: one in January during the presidency of my own country; and the second today.

We have been able to considerably improve things this year. For example, overcoming some domestic resistance, we have begun a dialogue on a regular and direct basis with the Special Representatives of the

Secretary-General and even with the Force Commanders in the field. This dialogue is also very helpful to us when we take decisions. We have also tried to go on missions to the field more often and to continue with the Arria-formula meetings. All of this means that the nature of the Council will become more modern, more open and, accordingly, more in keeping with its responsibilities, over which there can no longer be any kind of tutelage.

This initiative is being taken against the background of transparency, of the will to listen, of the desire to share. And this, as we see it, is the path for our Organization in the future. If we understand this and work together, the United Nations will have time on its side, instead of giving the impression that some within the Organization are fighting against time.

There are some things which we do not venture to undertake — not because of the difficulty inherent in them, but because sometimes we try to make them difficult precisely because we are not willing to face up to them.

We have begun to move forward on the road pointed out to us by New Zealand. It is now a matter of improving things, of listening to those who are acting in peace-keeping operations in the field. My delegation believes that the procedures it has suggested today deserve thorough analysis by the Security Council.

The President *(interpretation from Russian)*: There are no other names on the list of speakers.

The Security Council has heard the views of its members and of other States Members of the United Nations on the item on its agenda. These views, as well as those expressed by Member States during the discussions on relevant agenda items at the fiftieth session of the General Assembly, will be taken into account by the Council when it gives further consideration to the question of consultations with troop contributors.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3611/Corr.1

Security Council

Fiftieth Year

Provisional

3611th Meeting

Wednesday, 20 December 1995, 10.30 a.m.

New York

Corrigendum

Page 2, first column

For Mr. Patriota *read* Mr. Amorim

Page 30, second column, fifth paragraph, first line

For Mr. Patriota *read* Mr. Amorim

95-87141 (E)